thanksgiving vrs. sacrifice
fellowship
history vrs mystical

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/eucharisticfaith0000yngv_y0r2

EUCHARISTIC FAITH AND PRACTICE
EVANGELICAL AND CATHOLIC

EUCHARISTIC FAITH & PRACTICE
EVANGELICAL & CATHOLIC

BY

YNGVE BRILIOTH

Archbishop of Sweden, Uppsala

Authorised translation by

A. G. HEBERT, M.A.

of the Society of the Sacred Mission,
Kelham

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BV
823
.B73
1930
c.2
41,060

LONDON
S·P·C·K
1956

Published in 1930

Made in Great Britain

(The Dedication of the original Swedish edition.)

DEDICATED

WITH REVERENCE AND GRATITUDE

TO

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM

ARCHBISHOP OF UPPSALA

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The Swedish original, of which a revised and shortened translation is now offered to the English-speaking public, was written in 1925–6, while I occupied the chair of Ecclesiastical History in the Faculty of Theology at the Academy of Åbo, Finland. The limited supply of books at this recent foundation would have been a grave hindrance to my studies if the liberality, for which the Scandinavian libraries are justly famous, in lending books to other institutions had not enabled me to procure the necessary literature from the libraries of Stockholm, Uppsala and Helsingfors. But this fact, as well as the limited time at my disposal, and the vastness of the field to be covered, imposed upon me a rather severe restraint in the use of books. I can only hope that it has been possible for me to obtain what has been most essential and typical in each case. During the preparation of the English edition I have tried to remedy some of the defects of the book, and to bring the discussion up to date on a few important points. A thorough revision of the whole material would have demanded far more leisure than I have at present at my disposal.

In the Preface to the Swedish edition I acknowledged my debt of gratitude to all those who had furthered my work by advice, information or provision of books. Here it may suffice to mention the late Very Rev. J. A. McClymont, Edinburgh, Professor Vernon Bartlet of Mansfield College, Oxford, and my dear and faithful friend the Rev. G. H. Fendick, of All Saints', Clifton, who has taught me more about the Church of England than anyone else.

To apologise for the boldness of my attempt would certainly be vain, so far as it is not justified by the result. It would never have occurred to me to think of an English translation had not the present translator suggested the plan of an abridgment—the Swedish book has 488 pages—and offered his services. A definite injunction from his side prevents me from expressing as fully as I should like my sense of indebtedness to him. I may, however, be permitted to say that the appreciation which my book has met with from a member of the noble Kelham brotherhood, and the spirit of complete spiritual fellowship which has pervaded all our discussions, has been to me a revelation of the reality of Christian unity.

The experience of the fuller sacramental life of the English Church has helped more than anything to open my eyes to the hidden, half-forgotten riches of my own Church. The revival, after an interval of eight centuries, of intercourse between the Churches of England and Sweden is a remarkable feature in the religious history of Northern Europe in these days. It is my hope that this book may bear witness to the reality of this spiritual *commercium*, and perhaps also express in some measure the gratitude which I personally owe to English Christianity.

YNGVE BRILIOTH.

Lund, Sweden,
August 1930.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

It is often remarked how lamentable and terrible it is that the Sacrament of Unity should be a subject of controversy; might it not be expected that here at least the quarrels of Christians would be hushed? But it is a superficial remark. Just because Christianity is the answer to the problems of life, and just because the Eucharist stands at the very centre of Christianity, therefore it must necessarily be a centre of controversy.

The same is true of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ our Lord. All the issues of life meet there, all the problems of faith in God and His Kingdom, all life's contradictions and difficulties, and all man's sin; *therefore* all our controversies are found there too, for all our differences from one another are there reflected. But there also is found the reconciliation of those differences; their reconciliation, not through some happy formula of concord devised by men, but through the Divine act of redemption which triumphs over our separateness, and makes Jew and Greek, barbarian and Scythian, to be all one man in Christ Jesus.

All this is true of the sacrament which is the Memorial of that redemption. In our eucharistic doctrine and practice our differences from one another must always appear in their sharpest form. The fellowship of Christians in communion has been broken, and altar has been set up against altar; yet the Sacrament of Unity stands as a perpetual witness against our divisions. Those who kneel together at the same altar are often conscious of serious differences and of mutual suspicion; yet the fact that they kneel together at the altar is the symbol and the instrument of a unity deeper than their differences.

This book which Dr. Brilioth has given us is almost unique in the comprehensiveness of the picture which it gives of the diverse types of eucharistic belief and practice. He starts with the New Testament, and shows us there the variety of types, Synoptic, Pauline, Johannine; he traces the ideas down through the early Fathers and the liturgies, and shows us the various types in their historical development; and he brings the picture down to modern times by sketching the main types of eucharistic belief and practice in Evangelical Christendom. The fact that the post-Tridentine Roman Church and the Orthodox Eastern Churches lie outside the scope of this book is to be regarded less as a defect in it than as an invitation to pursue the same method in these regions also. But behind all the differences lies the reality of the sacrament itself, which embraces and comprehends all the different points of view. For this reason I am persuaded that this book is a contribution of the greatest value, to help different sorts of Christians to understand one another better.

I write as an Anglo-Catholic. We who regard ourselves as belonging, broadly, to the "Catholic" side of Christendom, feel very often that in books, newspapers and common talk less than justice is done to "Catholic" Christians. Thus we read criticisms of Popes and mediævals, schoolmen and monks, made by writers who evidently have very little idea of the extent to which these classes of people differed among themselves. Or, again, "Romanism" is criticised—perhaps we do it ourselves—in the spirit which assumes that all Roman Catholics are Ultramontanes of one single type. But a very little serious study shows that the Roman Church also is a very complex fact.

Does not the same thing happen in our own attitude towards those of the "Protestant" side? We are apt to think of Protestantism as if its outlook were the mere antithesis or negation of our own. In how many of our books are we told that "The Protestant position is that . . ."—as if Protestantism were all of one piece? Of course we are anxious to do justice to the moral and religious earnestness of Protestantism; we acknowledge the abuses which made some sort of change necessary at the Reformation, all the more because most of the abuses seem to be things of the past. But we, like Erasmus, find it as hard to understand the intense theological and religious convictions of the Reformation as "Protestants" find it to comprehend our own religious enthusiasms.

And this uncomprehending separatism is the key to all Western religious history for the past 400 years. The Roman Church and the Council of Trent made no effort to understand the Reformers; to call a doctrine "Lutheran" was sufficient condemnation. Similarly, Luther, and still more Calvin, on their side refused to try to understand. But if we believe that other people are only right in so far as they agree with us, and wholly wrong if they criticise us, we can hardly be surprised if they take the same attitude towards ourselves. "With the same measure that ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

The whole movement towards Christian reunion is based on the perception, dim or clear, that this exclusiveness is the measure of our failure. We are called "Catholics" and "Protestants"; but it is only the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Life-giver, who is truly catholic, truly universal. The Holy Spirit has had much to teach to "Protestants" as well as to "Catholics"; should we not then recognise that if they without us, then also we without them, cannot be made perfect?

It is the great value of this book of Dr. Brilioth that he is able to take up a truly mediatorial attitude. We "Catholics" can understand him, for he speaks the language of the ancient liturgies, and he can appreciate the glory of mediævalism as well as its failures. But at the same time he is able, as a Lutheran, to tell us what the protest against "the mass" really meant to those who made it; he can show us that the Reformers were not merely protesting against deplorable abuses, in the spirit of an Erasmus, but believed themselves to be affirming positive truths of vital importance to the Christian faith, truths of which mediævalism had lost sight, and of which even our revived Catholicism has need to be reminded. On the other hand, he can also show us how, under the force of that controversial exclusiveness, the negative side of the protest was continually emphasised, and how the result is to be seen in the impoverishment of Christian worship and the weakening of the *Evangelium* itself.

From the purely historical point of view there is one point among many others that deserves to be noted. Perhaps there is no historical character of anything like Luther's importance whose mind is so difficult to follow. Of the vast bulk of his writings, nearly all were thrown off at a white heat, with little care for consistency. The inconsistencies are often real enough, and not merely verbal; yet, as Dr. Brilioth has shown us with regard to the eucharist, there was a real consistency of idea and purpose behind.

The violence with which Luther split off from the Zwinglian party has always been a puzzle to historians, as it was to Zwingli himself, to Calvin, and to not a few Lutherans.

Yet the fact of his violence, when every consideration of policy called for unity, is enough to suggest that Luther believed, or felt, that there were real issues at stake; and Dr. Brilioth helps us to see what they were. In this respect, and in his account of Luther's struggles, not always successful, to keep a eucharistic faith alive among the complex influences at work, he has given us a mass of information of great value not otherwise obtainable in English. And one may hope that many will rise from the perusal of this book with the conviction that we at least in the Church of England have need to study Luther more closely and sympathetically than we have done in the past.

. . . .

Dr. Brilioth needs no introduction to English readers. The Swedish original of this book, *Nattvarden i evangeliskt gudstjänstliv*, was published in 1926 by Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, Stockholm; to whom my thanks are due for permission to translate it. This English version is, however, a free rather than a close translation, and in varying degrees in different parts the book has been very considerably shortened. The amount of condensation has been greatest in Chapter VII, on the Swedish Church; in that chapter nearly all the footnotes have been omitted, on the ground that those who would be able to profit by references to Swedish books would be able to read this book in the original.

The whole of the MS. has been carefully revised by the author, and brought up to date by notices of such books as Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*, and Oesterley's *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, which have appeared since the original book was written. Dr. Brilioth has also written a new concluding chapter, to replace the original conclusion, which dealt with the particular circumstances of the modern Church of Sweden. A few English quotations and references have been suggested by the translator and other English friends; but a reference to the Swedish book would show that by far the greater number of the English references are derived from the author's original work. The adequacy of his knowledge of the Church of England is fully attested by his book *The Anglican Revival* (Longmans, 1925).

I have to thank the publishers for permission to use some quotations from Dr. Linton's *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, and the Rev. E. E. Yelverton's *The Swedish Rite;* the Rev.

Prof. Manson and the Rev. J. Perret for help in reading through parts of the MS. and contributing suggestions and notes: and among the members of the Community to which I belong, in particular Fr. Herbert Kelly, for very much help and encouragement.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

Kelham,
August 1930.

CONTENTS

PAGE
AUTHOR'S PREFACE vii
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE ix

CHAP.
I. THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS 1
A survey of modern critical views—Two questions: Was the eucharist instituted by Jesus? Is there one normative Scriptural type of eucharistic doctrine?

II. THE EUCHARIST IN THE EARLY CHURCH . . 18
1. Eucharist or Thanksgiving 18
2. Communion and Fellowship 27
3. Commemoration, or the historical aspect . . 34
Additional Note on the occurrence of the words of institution in the primitive eucharist.
4. The eucharistic Sacrifice 42
5. Mystery and the Presence 49
The heathen mysteries and the Christian—Mystery in the New Testament—in the Fathers—in the Liturgies—in the practice of the church.

III. THE MIDDLE AGES IN THE WEST 70
1. The Gallican and Roman Rites 71
2. Aspects of the eucharist in the Middle Ages . . 78
Thanksgiving—Communion—Commemoration—Sacrifice and Mystery—Penance and morals.

IV. THE LUTHERAN TRADITION 94
1. Luther's eucharistic teaching 94
Luther's early writings—Anti-Roman writings—Anti-Zwinglian writings.
2. Lutheran forms of service 110
Early attempts at revision, up to 1525—Luther's *Formula Missæ*—Luther's *Deutsche Messe*—the Lutheran Church Orders.
3. An estimate of the Lutheran type 130
Thanksgiving—Communion—Commemoration—Sacrifice—Mystery.
4. The Lutheran Rite in modern Germany . . 144

CHAP. PAGE
V. THE REFORMED TRADITION 153
1. Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine 153
2. The Zürich Rite 159
3. Calvin's eucharistic doctrine 164
4. The Genevan Rite 171
5. The Reformed Rite on the Continent . . . 179
In French Switzerland and France—in German Switzerland, South Germany and Holland.
6. Anglo-Saxon Calvinism 186
Scottish Presbyterianism—the English Free Churches.

VI. THE ANGLICAN CHURCH 199
1. The older Anglicanism 199
Doctrinal formulæ of the Reformation period—Liturgies—the Caroline Divines—Traditional Anglicanism.
2. The Anglican Revival 214

VII. THE SWEDISH CHURCH 228
1. Mediæval Sweden 228
2. The eucharistic teaching of Olaus Petri . . . 231
Additional Note on the history of the Reformation in Sweden.
3. The Swedish mass of Olaus Petri 237
4. The advance of the Swedish mass, from 1531 to 1552 244
5. Laurentius Petri and the Church Order of 1571 . 249
6. King John III and the Liturgical Controversy . 254
7. The Swedish Rite from 1614 to the present day . 260
Additional Note: The modern Swedish liturgy.
8. The decline of communion and the present problem 270

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 276
Thanksgiving—Communion and fellowship—Commemoration—The eucharistic Sacrifice—Mystery.

INDEX OF NAMES 289

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 293

EUCHARISTIC FAITH AND PRACTICE EVANGELICAL AND CATHOLIC

CHAPTER I

THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS

The place of the eucharist in the life of the church is one of the most central problems which confront Evangelical Christendom to-day. It is a problem for the theologian, because the sacrament is a meeting-point on which all the issues of theology converge; for the liturgical reformer, whose business it is to help to provide a worthy outward expression for Christian worship; and for the pastor of souls, whose concern is with the church's actual life.

The Reformation was in many respects a re-discovery of the eucharist, as the following pages will show. But since the Reformation the history of the eucharist in the evangelical churches has been a story of slow alternations of decline and revival. In different ways and at different periods, England, Germany and Sweden have a story to tell of a gradual decline of the rite which had once been the crown and glory of Christian worship, till large numbers of church people in effect cease to be communicants, and the service itself becomes a rare and exceptional event; preachers no longer dare to use the bold language of the formularies, and church authorities are tempted to tamper with those formularies, to bring them into accord with the slack practice of the day. But when the claims of the pulpit to undisputed primacy, together with a rationalised theology, have all but completed the work of disintegration, another voice arises and claims to be heard; the irrepressible need of the soul of man for devotion, adoration, and mystery, awakens again the sense of reverence for ancient forms, and demands outward beauty and spiritual depth in the church's worship. The experience of the Church of England in the Oxford Movement and its sequel, and the corresponding but less intense movement in Germany, led by Kliefoth and Löhe, bids fair to spread to all the churches of the Reformation. On every side we see men groping after a fresh expression of the sense of mystery in worship; and this movement necessarily finds its centre in the Christian mystery *par excellence:* the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

But at this point the modern theologian is confronted with a difficulty which did not exist either for the men of the Reformation or for the Lutherans and Anglicans of the middle nineteenth century. They could assume for their sacramental teaching a basis of indisputable Biblical evidence; indisputable both as regards the fact of the institution and the Saviour's intention in instituting the sacrament. But in our day, to take for granted even that the eucharist rests upon the direct command of Jesus is, in fact, to evade one of the hardest problems with which modern study has to deal. The critical investigation of the last hundred years has left no stone unturned in the examination of the scriptural basis of the eucharist, which once was regarded as firmer than a rock. There is widespread searching of hearts; many a hungry soul believes itself to be faced with the alternative of sacrificing either its intellectual honesty or its longing to find in the church's holy rite the spiritual satisfaction which it needs.

Therefore a study of the eucharistic rite in the churches of the Reformation cannot avoid the consideration of the problem of the Eucharist and the Gospel. The problem resolves itself into two principal questions:

(i) Can the eucharist of the church still be derived from the action of Jesus in the night that he was betrayed?

(ii) Can any particular view of the rite be established on the basis of the New Testament evidence as the norm and standard by which all subsequent developments are to be judged?

Before we attempt to answer these questions, it is necessary to undertake a brief survey of the most important modern work upon the subject.

A survey of modern critical views.

To gain a view-point over the vast literature dealing with the origin of the eucharist and its original meaning, we cannot do better than begin with Albert Schweitzer's early work on the subject, *Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte des Urchristentums* (1901), the first part of which contains an acute analysis of various attempts made in the nineteenth century to solve the problem.

Schweitzer groups these under two headings: first, the view which emphasises the Memorial-aspect (*das Darstellungsmoment*), the act of Jesus at the Last Supper regarded as a symbolical action setting forth his passion. This view tends regularly to the acceptance of the record of the institution as authentic, but it does not succeed in explaining how and why the act came to be repeated in the eucharist of the primitive church. The second type of view lays the emphasis on the reception of the bread and wine in the act of communion (*das Genussmoment*). Taking this as the central point, it explains readily enough the repetition of the rite in the sacred meal of the church, but it finds difficulty with the historical situation in the night that the Lord was betrayed; and when worked out to its consequences it leads to the rejection of the accounts of the institution, these being regarded by the thoroughgoing critic as versions of the ætiological cult-legend which arose out of the eucharist itself. Under these two headings Schweitzer groups the various views with which he deals; his object is to show the impossibility of them all, in order to leave a clear field for his own eschatological view. Perhaps, however, the permanent value of his survey consists chiefly in his energetic discrimination of the two types.

These two types stand out against a background composed of a series of works which are content with a mere juxtaposition of the two elements.[1] The initiative lies with the second of the two types. For David Strauss (*Das Leben Jesu*, 1836) the action of Jesus at the Last Supper can contain no symbolical representation of his passion, because he cannot have foreseen his death; the predominant thought must have been that of the coming Feast in the Messianic Kingdom. Mark xiv. 25 ("I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine") is the only genuine element in the Synoptic account of the institution. But the immediate sequel was not the advent of the Kingdom, but the death of Jesus; and the church imported into the narrative of the Supper the reference to the passion. Similar, but more exaggerated, are the views of Bruno Bauer and Renan, for whom the Last Supper was simply an ordinary meal of Jesus with the disciples, and all that gave it a special character was a later addition.

Spitta[2] produced a highly original theory. For him too the whole reference to the passion is an addition to the account, but the original meaning was purely eschatological. The command of Jesus to eat his flesh and drink his blood is only intelligible as an anticipation of the Messianic Feast, in which the faithful should be fed with supernatural food and drink, which would be the Messiah himself. The Last Supper was not the Passover-feast, nor is the command to repeat the observance historical. Spitta agrees with the Fourth Evangelist that Jesus died on the 14th Nisan, and supposes that the disciples availed themselves of the permission of Numbers ix. 9 ff. to eat the Passover a month later; in this way he explains the association of the eucharist with the Passover and the passion.

---

[1] Such as Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* (1872); Weizsäcker, *Apostolisches Zeitalter* (1886); Beyschlag, *Das Leben Jesu* (1893); H. Holtzmann, in *Biblische Theologie* (1897).

[2] *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums* (1893), I. pp. 207–337.

Perhaps no other scholar has ever believed Spitta's fantastic theory. It is of interest because it shows how difficult it becomes to understand the narrative of the institution, when the communion-aspect in isolation is taken as the key to solve the problem. The same difficulty has led others (Percy Gardner,[1] Salomon Reinach) to suggest a non-Christian origin for the central act of Christian worship, such as the Eleusinian mysteries or the totemism of primitive religion. A more moderate view has as a rule made Paul the creator of the later idea of the eucharist; it was he who changed the primitive supper to a solemn religious rite, a memorial of the historical Saviour, and a means of mystical union with the Crucified. So, for Loisy,[2] it is Paul who was the real founder of the eucharist, on the ground of a subjective vision only, without any basis in genuine historical tradition.

On the other hand, those writers who concentrate attention on the action of Jesus at the Last Supper as the essential element, find it more possible to accept the narrative of the institution as authentic. Harnack's view is in many respects very conservative; believing that the Lord had his imminent death in full view, he accepts the act of institution as genuine, but not the command to repeat the action. At the same time he emphasises also the communion-aspect, but gives it a suspiciously modern interpretation: the Lord treated the material elements as a food of the soul, symbolising the forgiveness of sins, and thereby sanctified the normal functions of our natural life.[3]

---

[1] *The Origin of the Lord's Supper*, 1893. But Gardner has since modified his view.

[2] *Les Évangiles Synoptiques* (1908), II. 531 ff.

[3] In *Texte und Untersuchungen, VII ; Brot und Wasser : die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin.*

But it is to Jülicher that we must go for a fully logical expression of the implications of the "memorial-aspect." Accepting the authenticity of the oldest tradition, represented by Matthew and Mark, even to the extent of identifying the Supper with the Passover, he regards the act of Jesus as a parable, or rather a pair of parables, intended to explain to the disciples the meaning of his death: "attaching the deepest meaning, as usual, to quite ordinary things, he solemnly took leave of his own, making it clear to them that his execution was already planned, and hinting that his death should become a fount of blessing"; but he instituted no sacrament, and he contemplated no repetition of his action.[1] Schweitzer well remarks that something of Zwingli's spirit broods over this dispassionate and chilly exegesis.

But in spite of his desire to propound a new solution, Schweitzer himself must be reckoned as belonging to the same type. An energetic analysis of the texts leads him to the conclusions that the Markan narrative is alone authentic and original, the others having been modified by the influence of church usage.[2] His special point is that it is nowhere stated in Mark that the disciples were commanded to eat or drink, but only that they did so. It was while they handed the elements round that Jesus uttered the mysterious words, which give the meaning which the act had for him; to understand this meaning it is necessary to emphasise the eschatological outlook of the words which speak of his drinking it new in the Kingdom of God (Mark xiv. 25). He was speaking not only of his death, but of his death as the condition of the future reunion of himself and his disciples in the Kingdom; and it is only through a right understanding of the relation between the passion and the mystery of his Messiahship that the riddle of the Last Supper can be solved. Doubtless Schweitzer provides a valuable corrective, here as elsewhere, to the Liberal Protestant view. But he cannot be said to have succeeded any better than other scholars who have attempted to solve the problem from this side, in explaining how the rite ever came to be repeated in the primitive church.

The same may be said of two French writers, Réville[3] and Goguel,[4] who both show traces of Schweitzer's influence.

---

[1] "Zur Geschichte der abendmahlsfeier in der ältesten Kirche," in *Theologische Abhandlungen, Karl von Weizsäcker gewidmet* (1892).

[2] *Op. cit.*, I. pp. 48 ff., 56 ff.

[3] *Les origines de l'eucharistie*, 1908.

[4] *L'eucharistie des origines à Justin Martyr*, 1910.

They agree in accepting the Synoptic record as broadly historical; that Jesus had his death in view, and intended to interpret its meaning, and that the eschatological outlook is fundamental. Réville finds no direct link between the Last Supper and the sacred meal of the primitive church; the connection was made by Paul. For Goguel the eschatological view is the only possible one, and the thought of the Covenant is a later addition. The Lord's act symbolised his "giving of himself to his disciples; that is, the very essence of his thought, his faith, his heart; he spends himself to kindle in them the fire which burns in himself, to bring birth and maintain in each of them the aspirations, the energies, the certainties which animate him."[1] But Goguel is not quite sure that the command to repeat the rite is not genuine; the breaking of bread in the primitive church included the memory of the Master's death, but the cup was a later addition, due to memories of the Last Supper. Another typical presentation of the outlook of the Liberal school is given in W. Heitmüller's *Taufe und Abendmahl*.[2]

But this line of thought has been carried a step further, with the help of a most impressive historical and liturgical scholarship, in one of the latest works on the subject, Hans Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* (1926). This is all the more important because it attempts to connect the Biblical evidence with the early development of the Christian liturgy. If certain points in his theory are open to criticism, particularly in what concerns the New Testament period, it cannot be doubted that many of the links in the chain which he has attempted to forge will stand the test of time.

Working backwards from the liturgical material, Lietzmann arrives at a distinction between two types in the primitive eucharist, more or less in agreement with Schweitzer's classification. The first type starts from the Jewish family meals, which Jesus celebrated with his disciples, and which the Jerusalem church continued to celebrate after his death, as "the breaking of bread" in glad expectation of the Parousia. Here there was no direct connection with the Last Supper; the essential point was just the breaking of bread with thanksgiving and blessing. This type survived in the *agape*, the form of which can be studied in Hippolytus' Church Order; it appears in the *Didache*, and can be traced in the Egyptian liturgy of Serapion in the middle of the fourth century.

---

[1] P. 100.

[2] *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*, 1911.

The second type is largely due to Paul. It is true that there was a genuine tradition of the Last Supper, represented by the Markan account, on which the other Synoptists are mainly dependent; this tradition is admitted to be highly trustworthy, and to be independent of Paul. But it had no effect on the sacred meal of the primitive church, till Paul, acting on the basis of what he held to be a direct revelation from the Lord, remodelled the eucharistic practice of his churches, having come to understand, as he believed, the real meaning of the traditional accounts of the Supper. This Pauline type was characterised by its central emphasis on Christ's death, and the incorporation of the individual into Christ. It is reflected especially in the anaphora of Hippolytus, which is according to Lietzmann the most ancient of our liturgical texts, after the *Didache*.

The most important part of Lietzmann's work is that which deals with the history of the liturgy, and we shall consider it further in the next chapter. His reconstruction of the origins of the rite certainly rests on a less solid foundation, as indeed is the case with all similar attempts. When he makes Paul the real founder of the eucharist as a sacrament of the church, he is, it seems, too much under the influence of the traditional teaching of the Liberal school. It is not easy to see how such a view can be reconciled with the contention that the Markan account is independent of the Pauline, and in the main a trustworthy record of what happened at the Last Supper. It is to me simply inconceivable that this story of the Last Supper should have been narrated without any reference to the sacred meal of the Christian community; that it should not have given, at least for the participants, a new and deeper meaning to the simple eucharistic rite. We shall return to this point later in this chapter. But we must not close this short discussion of Lietzmann's book without emphasising that both his distinction of the two original types of the primitive eucharistic idea and his vindication of the reliability of the Markan account are results of permanent value, and must be the starting-points of future investigations of the problem.[1]

---

[1] It must, however, be remembered that nothing like a definite consensus of opinion has yet been reached with regard to the exegesis of the records of the institution; thus in the article "Abendmahl im neuen Testament" in the new edition of the German Encyclopædia, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Prof. K. L. Schmidt argues that the earliest account is contained in Luke xxii. 15, 16 and 18, thus returning to the theory that the Last Supper in its original meaning had no reference to the passion and death of the Lord, but was simply a Messianic rite, an anticipation of the future Feast in the Kingdom. See p. 9, below.

The first question : Can the church's eucharist truly claim to have been instituted by Christ ?

It would be easy to extend almost indefinitely our catalogue of modern reconstructions of the origin of the eucharist. We have, however, covered the main points which have emerged ; and it is quite evident that we have received no clear answer to our questions. The various interpretations of the events reflect all too faithfully the theological tendencies of their authors, and we have every right to refuse *iurare in verba magistri.*

We have reviewed various attempts to solve the problem of the accounts of the institution in relation to the church's eucharist. Writers like Réville, who are disposed to accept the genuineness at least of the Markan account, commonly emphasise so strongly the eschatological outlook and the unique character of the Last Supper, that a gulf opens between it and the sacred meals of the primitive church; Paul has therefore to become the second founder of the eucharist, and many writers are prepared to allow much influence to the mystery-religions. For the Comparative-religion school it has become almost a dogma that the eucharist, as a religious rite, can only have been derived from this source; and, hence, Paul did not merely add to the simple religious meal of the disciples the solemn memorial of Christ's death, but evolved out of his own brain the account of the institution, even though there may have been certain features in the genuine tradition about the Last Supper to serve as a basis for the new version of the story.

We shall return later to the subject of the mystery-religions.[1] For the present, the first point to be considered is the relation between the Pauline and the Synoptic records of the institution. The Pauline account is the earlier; are the others dependent on it? Some writers insist that his words " I received of the Lord " (1 Cor. xi. 23) refer to a vision; [2] but this assumption is scarcely justified. Even if such an interpretation were necessary—and it is not necessary—it would still remain probable that such a vision would presuppose a background of historical tradition about the Last Supper; such a definite concrete act as that which Paul describes cannot be the product of his own imagination.[3]

---

[1] Chapter II, section 5.

[2] So Eisler in *Zeitschrift für neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1925, p. 162 f.

[3] Cf. Réville, p. 93. According to Lietzmann (p. 254 f.) Paul had the historical tradition of the Last Supper from the early community in

But the decisive point must be the question whether the Synoptic accounts can be regarded as dependent on the Pauline. A comparison of the texts renders this peculiarly improbable.[1] It is hardly credible that Mark should have omitted the words "Do this in remembrance of me" if he found them in his source, or the words "which is for you," occurring after "this is my body." Again, the Pauline "the new covenant in my blood" would seem to be a later version than the Markan "my blood of the covenant." Yet again, the undeniable fact that the eschatological outlook is more pronounced in the Synoptists than in Paul, tells not only for their independence of him, but also for their greater originality. The same may be said of the first part of the Lukan version (Luke xxii. 14–19*b*), which seems to represent an account independent alike of Mark and of Paul.[2] It may well be that the Markan and Pauline accounts go back to a common source; but the important point is that the Markan account is not dependent on Paul. If so, then the record of the institution cannot be Paul's invention; at least in its simplest form (the Markan) it must go back to the living tradition of the Jerusalem church of the earliest days. And as it cannot have been evolved out of the simple eucharistic meal, which needed no such "ætiological legend" to account for it, it must be derived from a unique act on that last night, which those who were present were unable to forget.

Jerusalem, but his new interpretation of it was due to a revelation of the Exalted Lord.

[1] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 504 ff.; Lietzmann, p. 218 ff.

[2] The Lukan text appears in two different redactions, besides several intermediate forms: the longer, of the earliest Greek MSS., and the shorter, omitting vers. 19*b* and 20, of the Western text. Common to both is the strong emphasis on the Last Supper as a Passover meal, the eschatological outlook, and the mention of the Cup before the Bread; but the longer text adds to this the command to repeat the rite, and the mention of the second chalice, after the meal. The problems presented by these two textual traditions are very intricate, and there is no unanimity among scholars. The theory of K. L. Schmidt, who accepts as genuine only vers. 15, 16 and 18, thus leaving no real account of the institution in Luke, seems to me wholly arbitrary. On the other hand, the idea of Oesterley (*The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 181), that the words "with desire I have desired" signify an unfulfilled wish, is obviously inconsistent with the context. But it may well be matter of discussion whether the inverted order of the Bread and the Cup may perhaps reflect an earlier tradition than that of a technical Passover celebration; and it may possibly be argued that the two cups of the longer text are not inconsistent with what we know of the *Kiddûsh* ceremonial, in which two cups are usually mentioned (cf. Lietzmann, p. 202 ff.).

Needless to say, this does not mean that all the difficulties in the way of its authenticity have been overcome. But most of the suspicions which have been cast on it have their basis in preconceived ideas as to what the Lord might have thought and done on the night in which he was betrayed. The discussion of this question would take us too far afield; however, the best exegesis seems to teach that in that hour Jesus was indeed full of the thought of his death, but of his death as the necessary road to the glory of the Kingdom; and that the words which he uttered over the bread and the cup were permeated with these thoughts, and probably also set forth the meaning of his death as the seal of an intimate fellowship of the disciples with their Master and with one another.[1] Yet we cannot claim that there is anything like complete agreement, even if we take into account only the more moderate critics. A question which cannot yet be regarded as settled is the question whether the Last Supper was the celebration of the Passover or a *Kiddûsh*; but the evidence certainly seems to point to the latter alternative.[2]

But even if the records of the institution appear to vindicate themselves as genuine, at least in all essentials, we have still to find some explanation of the connection of the institution with the eucharist in the church. How was it that a rite ever came to be repeated whose meaning was closely bound up with one particular historical occasion? We have seen that writers who treat the record of the institution as authentic usually regard the sacred meal of the earliest church as unconnected with any special memory of the Lord's death, and attribute that interpretation of the Supper to Paul. This view colours most modern accounts of eucharistic origins.[3] It may be supported by the absence from the Markan account of the command "Do this in remembrance of me"; but above all, by the manner in which the "breaking of bread" is spoken of in the Acts; it is a religious meal which the brethren eat "with joy and gladness of heart, praising God" (Acts ii. 46), but there is no allusion to any memorial of the death of Jesus as the central feature. The brief allusions in Acts may be supported by the earliest extra-canonical evidence. Particularly in the *Didache* we find eucharistic prayers which would be very suitable for a religious repast, but contain no reference whatever to any institution by Jesus.[1] Nor does either Clement of Rome or Ignatius derive the eucharist from the Lord's institution. Réville hazards the assertion that they did not even know of the accounts[2]—a point which would fit in with the theory which Wetter[3] sought to prove from his studies in the early liturgies, that the words of institution were absent from the liturgy in primitive times. The silence of the Fourth Gospel with regard to the institution is also alleged in support of the theory.

---

[1] So Goguel, p. 99.

[2] See Srawley, *Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 6 ff.; Réville, p. 128 ff.; Lietzmann, p. 211 ff. The arguments of the *Kiddûsh*-theory, and also for the reliability of the Johannine tradition, have been stated very clearly by Oesterley, who also finds in the Discourses of John xiv.–xvii. reminiscences both of the *Kiddûsh*-ritual and of the religious conversation which accompanied it: p. 184 ff. Lately, however, the Synoptic tradition with regard to the Last Supper has found a defender in Prof. K. Völker, *Mysterium und Agape* (1927), p. 17 ff.

[3] See *e.g.* Réville, p. 148; Lietzmann, p. 253 f.

Since then, it is argued, the religious meal of the primitive church (which included what came later to be called eucharist and *agape*, but with no sense of a distinction between them) cannot be derived from the Lord's institution, it is to be regarded rather as a continuation of the religious meals common in Judaism, at which bread was blessed and broken by the head of the family, and usually also a cup was passed round, with formulæ similar to those which we find in the *Didache*. It is not denied that there may have been the memory of the death of Jesus at such meals, which must indeed have been regarded by the Apostles as a continuation of their meals of fellowship with him; in particular the story of Emmaus makes it plain that at the breaking of bread there might indeed be the assurance of the Saviour's living presence.

Such arguments are bound to carry weight; and without doubt they illustrate an important side of the primitive eucharist. On the other hand, it is impossible to escape from the fact that the Synoptic Gospels are among our chief sources for our knowledge of the faith and worship of the primitive church, and the Synoptic Gospels contain the record of the institution. If it can be regarded as certain that at least the Markan account is independent of the Pauline, and more original, what can that Markan account contain but the belief of the early Palestinian church about the origin of their eucharist? If it is right to postulate a common source for Mark and Paul, that source will go back to the very earliest period that we could possibly reach. The absence from Mark and Matthew of the command to repeat the rite is of minor importance; for it is hardly conceivable that the accounts of the institution should have been preserved and written down, unless they had been regarded as describing the origin and the pattern of the regular religious meal of the Christian church;[1] and there is no other point in the Synoptic tradition to which that meal could reasonably be attached, except possibly the Feeding of the Multitudes; but in this case the connection would be very artificial.

---

[1] Lietzmann, p. 238.

[2] P. 45.

[3] *Altchristliche Liturgien*, I. p. 59 ff. We shall return to Wetter's theory in Chap. II.

This does not mean that the ideas which dominate the record of the institution must necessarily have been present in the same proportion in the eucharist of the earliest days. Nevertheless, there need be nothing incompatible between the gladness of heart of which we read in Acts and the memory of the Lord's death; thus, if the phrase " the new covenant in my blood " was really charged with the eschatological thought of the coming Kingdom, it would at once provide a reason for celebrating with gladness the Lord's death as the necessary condition of the advent of the Kingdom; and this all the more because the picture in Acts presupposes the appearances of the Risen Lord, with all the new light that was thereby shed upon the cross. The eschatological outlook may provide also another connection between the Last Supper and the church's rite; the disciples must continue in union with the Ascended Lord till the new day dawns, " proclaiming his death, till he come."

Nor, again, does it mean that the act which the Lord performed in the night that he was betrayed is the *only* antecedent of the church's eucharist. It seems to me unjustifiable to insist on stating the matter as a rigid " either—or." Just as the last Supper itself had two sides, and the symbolical action of Jesus on that night was performed at a social meal of a common Jewish type, so the religious meal of the earliest Christians can have had a double character : first, as the continuation of the common meal of the Apostolic circle, with the emphasis on their fellowship with one another and with the Ascended Lord, and second, as the repetition of the Last Supper, with the emphasis on the death of Jesus, but with this act of remembrance so blended with the eschatological hope of the Kingdom as only to deepen the note of joy. Luke at least can hardly have been conscious of any incompatibility between the two sides, since he has preserved for us both the narrative of the institution in his Gospel, and the notices of the "breaking of bread" in Acts. We may say that the memorial of the Lord's death would be, as it were, an intense focus of religious warmth within the wider circle of the common meal. At first it may have only been the possession of a very small group. But it had in it that intensity which is the motive power of all religious development; it had the strength to conquer. The whole history of the eucharist from that primitive time is the story of that conquest.

---

[1] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 506 ff. As I have argued above, Lietzmann's argument on this point is very far from convincing.

If this be right, the development for which Paul was responsible, and which eventually led to the separation of the ritual action from the common meal, involved actually no radical change, but only a deepened apprehension of the relation of the death of Jesus and the eucharist, and the introduction into every supper of the religious focussing-point of the memorial of his death. It was the first great victory, perhaps the most signal victory, in the history of the conquest.

Yet both these lines go back to Jesus himself; both are dominated by the fact of his personality, and the memory of him, but also by the assurance of his continual presence and the hope of his return. It was because they had been hallowed by the presence of Jesus at the head of the table that the forms of the Jewish common meal passed with Christianity into a wider world; and it was because they knew that they were fulfilling the command of Jesus in celebrating the eucharist in remembrance of his death that the evangelists preserved for us the record of the institution.

Here then we have what is surely the only possible answer to the question which we asked: whether it can truly be claimed that the eucharist of the church was instituted by our Lord. For our faith it must be sufficient to be certain, as we can be certain, that this holy rite stood from the very beginning at the centre of the stream of spiritual life which had its source in the Master himself, and which is itself the chief witness to the power which was in him. And the place which the holy rite has held through all Christian history, as the means to the communication of the Christ-life and of fellowship in Christ, remains as a fact which no psychological subjectivism can explain away. Faith sees here the activity of the Ascended Lord, continuing and confirming the work of his earthly ministry.

The second question: Can any particular view of the eucharist be claimed, on the basis of the New Testament, as the norm and standard by which all subsequent developments are to be judged?

Attempts have frequently been made, especially in Germany, to put theological reconstructions of the original eucharist to a practical use. Their authors have desired to make their particular theories into standards for the remodelling of the eucharistic practice of their own day. Spitta,[1] for instance, starting from his eschatological theory of the Last Supper, wished to remove from the Lutheran service all that related to the death of Jesus, and " the materialising of the original idea of the bread of life which is already traceable in Paul, and which made the eucharist into a *mysterious tremendum* "—leaving only the simple service of praise and thanksgiving. Another writer, after the usual professorial chopping-up of the texts and the elimination from them of all definitely sacramental ideas, ends with " the wish that the Lutheran doctrine of the eucharist may become more and more free from Catholic adulteration, and return to the *κοινωνία Χριστοῦ*, in the Pauline sense." [2]

If the principle underlying these claims were admitted, it would follow that every theological school of thought would have to have its own liturgy. But it belongs to the nature of liturgical forms that they cannot be subject to such treatment, least of all to so masterful a despotism as that of the modern professor. It belongs to the nature of liturgy, not indeed to be irreformable, but to maintain a continuity of practice, which can unite the men of each generation with one another and with the past. It preserves the treasures of the past, even when contemporary opinion sees little value in them, till in course of time their value is rediscovered, maybe, by a later generation. It is an idea which is well expressed in one of the *Tracts for the Times*: [3] " the consecrated form of religion will be like a fair statue, which lies buried for ages, but comes forth at length, as beautiful as ever." It is then a false simplification of the problem when one or another school of theology seeks to deduce from the New Testament data a doctrine of the eucharist so complete that it may claim to serve as a standard for the religious life of succeeding generations.

---

[1] *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, I. pp. 333–37.

[2] G. Kittel, " Die Wirkungen des Christlichen Abendmahls nach dem neuen Testament," in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1925, pp. 214–37.

[3] No. 32. Cf. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, p. 194.

It follows that we ought to abstain from the attempt to find in the Scriptures one normative liturgical type. In this sphere as in others we ought to seek in the Scripture less a system of doctrine than a life; life in its apparently inconsistent variety, rather than a standard form. We must take pains to appreciate the richness and manifoldness in the New Testament evidence; otherwise we shall miss the fullness of the Divine revelation, and take as a substitute some one-sided expression of fragmentary aspects of it.

In this manifoldness we have already observed a double antithesis; first, between the breaking of bread, the social meal of the disciples, having its associations with the days when the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, and, within this wider circle, a religious focussing-point, which is the commemorative act, the proclaiming of the Lord's death, the means of union with the Crucified; and second (in a measure corresponding with the first), the antithesis between the part of the communicants at the Last Supper and that of the Lord, between the act of communion and of the act of celebrating.

This antithesis constitutes a problem for the practical ordering of the eucharist, just as much as for the historical investigation of its origin. It can in no case be solved by the discovery of some happy formula; the antithesis is the very seal of life, and it is entirely fruitless to attempt to remove it by one-sided rationalising explanations. It is the root of all the rich development of the various elements of the eucharist throughout its history, embracing the various needs and the various expressions of the life of faith, which correspond to various religious temperaments, yet held together at the centre by unity in the Divine life, out of whose earthly incarnation it springs.

It is our next task to distinguish the chief of these elements as they appear in the New Testament and the early church. We shall have no simple or infallible criterion to judge whether any element is truly evangelical; every essential element in the primitive eucharist must be admitted and accorded recognition. We shall see, however, that it is only too possible for one or other of these elements to be emphasised at the expense of the others; and that this is the main cause of the impoverishment of eucharistic worship in nearly every part of Christendom. Still more serious is the danger which springs from isolation of one or another of the genuine elements of the evangelical eucharist, and its separate development apart from the other elements. It is then easily overpowered by the forces of religious materialism, and the result is often the degradation of the Christian sacrament to a pagan level; the only remedy is a return to the life of the Gospel. Finally, it is possible that this life, in its development in history, may bring to light fresh aspects of the eucharist, of which only hints can be discovered in primitive Christianity.

In the next chapter we shall endeavour to give a sketch of the eucharist in the early church. The last few years have witnessed an immense activity in liturgical study, in which Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars have taken an equal share. Many problems remain unsolved; but the careful and exact work which has been done has certainly brought out in a stronger light the spiritual life of which the liturgical forms are the expression.

In our account we shall seek to characterise the broad features which are most significant from the religious point of view, neglecting the strange exuberance which liturgical growth sometimes exhibits, as well as many phenomena which fall below the spiritual level of genuine Christianity. It will be our object to seek for the underlying principles of unity, not to tabulate varieties; and the interests of clearness and brevity will sometimes make somewhat violent generalisations necessary. We shall also be obliged to take up a definite position in regard to certain historical questions which are still under discussion.

Furthermore, our study of the liturgical development must not leave out of sight the development of dogma; for liturgy and doctrine always influence one another in a variety of ways, and the formulæ of worship come to embody the conclusions of theological speculation. But liturgical forms, in so far as they are able to develop freely, reflect more accurately than forms of doctrine the religious life which underlies both. Above all, the key to the right understanding of eucharistic doctrine is to be found in the liturgical services, while the formulated doctrine sometimes bears clear witness to the incapacity of merely intellectual statements to comprehend and to reproduce meanings that transcend reason.

Our study of the New Testament evidence has already given us our starting-point, in the antitheses, evident already in the Last Supper itself, between the glad meal of fellowship and the memorial of the Lord's passion, and between the part of the communicants and that of the Lord. These antitheses may be shaped into four main elements or aspects of the eucharist:

(1) *Thanksgiving*, or Eucharist.
(2) *Communion-fellowship*.
(3) *Commemoration*, or the historical side.
(4) *Sacrifice*, including the act of Memorial, and the Church's self-oblation.

To these is to be added (5) *Mystery*, which embraces and unites all the others, and bridges the gap between the one act of the Saviour and the innumerable eucharists in which that act is apprehended in the experience of faith, and its benefits appropriated.

CHAPTER II

THE EUCHARIST IN THE EARLY CHURCH

1. Eucharist or Thanksgiving.

The word "eucharist" has been associated with the rite from the very beginning, and in a number of languages it has become one of its names. In the Gospels it is used interchangeably with εὐλογεῖν, "to bless," for the thanksgiving over food;[1] it is so used at the Feedings of the Multitudes, at the Last Supper and at Emmaus, and similarly by Paul on board ship, and in Rom. xiv. 6, 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4. As it is likely that Jesus on these occasions followed the Jewish customs, there is a possibility that we may be able to determine the character of the thanksgivings which he then made.[2] Paul as a rule describes the rite as the Lord's Supper, but he speaks once of the "cup of blessing" (ποτήριον εὐλογίας); the form of the expression seems to show that he means by the phrase the hallowing of the wine for sacramental use.

In the second-century writers "eucharist" becomes the regular name for the rite—perhaps in imitation of the usage of Hellenistic Judaism, for in Philo the word is used of various ritual acts—and at the same time the note of thanksgiving is ever more strongly accentuated. Thus Ignatius regularly describes the service as the eucharist, and it is evidently the same as the *agape*; but he gives no hint of the subject-matter of the thanksgiving. Drews has, however, rendered it probable that the first epistle of Clement of Rome preserves traces of liturgical forms; in chap. 20, the thanksgiving for the marvel of creation, to be compared with the corresponding forms in the later liturgies; in chaps. 9–12, fragments of a liturgical thanksgiving recapitulating the story of redemption, as do also, perhaps, parts of Hebrews

---

[1] See J. O. F. Murray: *Εὐχαριστία, εὐχαριστεῖν*, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. III; art. "Eucharistie" in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*.

[2] See Box, "The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist," in the same volume of *Journal of Theological Studies*; Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925).

xi. In chaps. 59–61 he thinks that the prayer for the church is from the liturgy; and, above all, that in chap. 34 the mention of the hosts of angels singing the threefold "holy" means that the *Sanctus* had already become part of the service.[1]

In the *Didache* we find the prayers used for a eucharistic meal, probably in the Syrian church about the end of the first century. That the occasion is a Christian form of the Jewish common meal, a single act which is at once eucharist and *agape*, may now be regarded as certain, and has recently been brought out again by Lietzmann;[2] the forms of prayer given in chaps. ix. and x. are meant to be used at the breaking of bread in the Sunday service mentioned in chap. xiv. There is first an introductory blessing of the Cup and the Bread, and after the meal follows the final thanksgiving. Our present concern is to note how the idea of thanksgiving dominates these prayers and moulds their form. They are probably modelled on the prayers in the synagogue ritual, though the parallels which are adduced from the *Kiddûsh* and the *Shemôneh 'Esreh* show no more than a general affinity; the nearest likeness is that of the prayer for the gathering together of the church with the tenth Benediction in the *Shemôneh 'Esreh*.[3] We shall have to return to this point in considering the aspect of Communion. The thanksgiving passes on from natural gifts to "the life and the knowledge which thou hast made known to us through thy Servant Jesus," from the act of creation which forms the starting-point for the Sabbath benedictions in the *Kiddûsh*-ritual, to spiritual gifts and blessings. The note of joy which breaks forth also in the words "Before all things we thank thee that thou art mighty" may well be taken as illustrating the "gladness of heart" to which the Acts of the Apostles testify. This is, in the proper sense, the eucharistic aspect of the rite. We saw in the last chapter that there is no incompatibility between this and the eschatological hope of the coming Kingdom; and here in the *Didache* it is just the assurance of participation in the Kingdom that calls forth the church's thanks and praise. The *Hosanna*, as we meet it here for the first time in a eucharistic ritual, is saturated with the intense expectation of the great Advent; and the thought that the eucharist is celebrated " until his coming again " is one that the church has never forgotten.

---

[1] *Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie.* The passage from chap. 34 runs as follows: "Let us contemplate the whole multitude of angels, how they stand ready to do his will. For the Scripture says, Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him, and thousand thousands ministered unto him; and they cried, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord Sabaoth; the whole creation is full of his glory. And when we come together in unity, let us likewise with one mouth call on him with all our might, that we may be partakers of his great and glorious promises."

[2] Völker tries to prove, in *Mysterium und Agape*, that the eucharist and the *agape* are two independent acts, of which the *agape* only came into general use in the latter part of the second century. But his attempt to support this theory by taking the word ἐμπλησθῆναι in *Did.* x. 7 in a purely spiritual sense is far from convincing.

[3] Oesterley, p. 131.

In Justin the word " eucharist " is used of the thanksgiving over the offered gifts, in the accounts of the communion of the newly-baptised in *Apol.* chap. 65, and of the regular Sunday service in chap. 67; it is there implied that the prayer is extempore. In chap. 66, the sacrament itself is also called the eucharist. The *Apology* tells us nothing about the subject-matter of the thanksgiving; but Drews is doubtless right in finding information on this point in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (chap. 41), where we are told that Jesus instituted the eucharist " that we might thank God, that he has created the world and all that therein is for man's sake, and that he has delivered us from the sin in which we were born, and that he has cast down dominions and powers through him who suffered according to his will."

From the third century onwards the Greek Fathers use the word " eucharist " no longer of the whole service, but only of the eucharistic prayer, or else of the sacred elements. Tertullian and Cyprian use *eucharistia* in the latter sense, and so does Augustine; but from his time onwards it drops out of use till its revival by the mediæval scholastics. The Fathers of the third century tell us nothing about the contents of the eucharistic prayer with which they were familiar; but Cyprian mentions the *Sursum corda* with the reply *Habemus ad Dominum*, which is one of the most ancient of all Christian liturgical forms.

It is found, with the following versicle and response, in the anaphora of Hippolytus, which has been preserved in the various versions of the Egyptian Church Order. That this document really represents the use of the Roman church in the early third century may be regarded as established by the independent researches of Dom Connolly and E. Schwartz; the arguments which have recently been adduced against this result can hardly claim to be conclusive.[1]

---

[1] R. Lorentz, *De Egyptische Kerkordering en Hippolytus van Rome* (Haarlem, 1929). See review by A. Robinson in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1929. Connolly, *The so-called Egyptian Church Order* (Cambridge, 1916); C. H. Turner, *The Church Order of St. Hippolytus*, C.Q.R., Oct. 1917 and Oct. 1918.

After the introductory responses, thanksgiving is made to God through Jesus Christ, " who is thy inseparable Word, through whom thou didst make all things, and he was well-pleasing unto thee "; who was born of the Virgin and became incarnate, and " fulfilling thy will and acquiring a holy people for thee, stretched out his hands for suffering, that he might free from suffering those who believed in thee " [1]; and so, through the mention of his voluntary passion, his victory over death and Satan, and his Resurrection, the prayer passes on to the words of institution, and thence to a short anamnesis and the epiclesis.

The peculiarity of this form is, first, its concentration on the life and work of Christ; it passes quickly from the first article of the Creed to the second, by way of the Logos. And second, it does not allow the note of thanksgiving to ring out in full clearness, because it fails to connect the eucharistic prayer with the angels' song and the *Sanctus*.

Bishop Serapion's anaphora is the earliest complete text in which the *Sanctus* appears. After the introductory versicles, it continues : " It is meet and right to praise, to hymn, to glorify thee, the unbegotten Father of the only-begotten Jesus Christ. We praise thee, O unbegotten God, who art unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible by any created substance. We praise thee, who art known by thy Son, the Only-begotten, and through him art spoken of and interpreted and made known to created nature. . . . Thou art the Fount of life, the Fount of light, the Fount of all grace and all truth, O lover of men, O lover of the poor, who reconcilest thyself to all, and drawest all to thyself through the advent of thy only beloved Son. We beseech thee, make us living men. Give us the Spirit of Light, that we may know thee who art true, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ. Give us thy Holy Spirit that we may be able to tell forth and to enunciate thy unspeakable mysteries. May the Lord Jesus speak in us, and the Holy Spirit, and hymn thee through us. For thou art far above all rule and authority and power and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. Beside thee stand thousand thousands and myriad myriads of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers. By thee stand the two most honourable six-winged Seraphim, with two wings covering the face, and with two the feet, and with two flying, and crying ' holy,' with whom also receive our cry of ' holy ' as we say—

---

[1] Translation from Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, p. 30 f.

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Sabaoth,
Full is the heaven and the earth of thy glory."

The prayer continues: "Full is the heaven, full also is the earth of thy excellent glory, Lord of hosts, fill also this sacrifice with thy power"—and so to the words of institution, and the epiclesis.

This anaphora of Serapion certainly gives the impression of being a composition rather than drawn directly from an impersonal liturgical tradition. But that does not lessen its value; for it is the characteristic of the primitive service that room was given for such individual freedom, within the limits of certain fixed points, two of which were the *Sursum corda* and the *Sanctus*.

We must now glance at the eucharistic prayer of the Clementine Liturgy, in the *Apostolic Constitutions*; [1] it belongs to the Syrian type, and like Serapion's is evidently a composition. It is of immense length; the first part, from *Sursum corda* to *Sanctus*, would occupy four pages of this book; doubts have indeed been raised whether it was ever intended for actual use in church, but probably without reason. It begins with the praise of God for his great glory—as in Serapion, but with greater fullness—and goes on to the generation of the Word, and the creation of the world through him; here it swells out into a song of praise for the beauty of nature. Then it tells the story of the creation of man, and the history of the Patriarchs up to the entry into Canaan, at which point it passes abruptly to the *Sanctus* (with the *Benedictus*, but without the *Hosanna* which comes later in this liturgy). After the *Sanctus* it goes on to the Incarnation, and tells the story of the life and death of Jesus. It is probable that this prayer represents a very ancient tradition, of which, as we have already noticed, Drews has found traces in Hebrews, in Clement, in Justin, Hippolytus and Novatian. It is possible that its length is due to the desire of the compiler to collect all the liturgical material that lay to hand.

The Liturgy of St. James and the other Syrian liturgies follow the same general plan. They are briefer and better suited for actual use; but it must not be inferred that brevity is a mark of greater antiquity. In the Liturgy of St. James the *Sanctus* occurs in the longer form, which it retains in most Eastern and Western liturgies, through the addition of the *Benedictus* and *Hosanna* as in Matt. xxi.[2]

---

[1] A complete translation of this liturgy in F. E. Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church*. Greek text in Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 1–27.

[2] Brightman, p. 50 ff.

A variety of problems connected with the anaphora, which are of the greatest importance for the history of the eucharist, has been raised anew by recent investigation, notably Lietzmann's important study, *Messe und Herrenmahl ;* and we cannot excuse ourselves from facing them. Is the thanksgiving for the creation an original part of the eucharistic prayer, or does the text of *Hippolytus*, which centres round the atonement and redemption, represent an earlier tradition? Closely related to this question is that of the *Sanctus*: is it an original part of the liturgy or a relatively late introduction? Its absence from the *Church Order of Hippolytus* would, according to Lietzmann, not be due to omission, but would represent a primitive type—the Pauline; a type not essentially eucharistic, but characterised mainly by a mystical commemoration of the passion of Christ. Connected with this question is another: Are the Jewish elements in the developed liturgies (*e.g.* the Clementine) to be regarded as part of the earliest stratum, or as later additions, due to the growing tendency to an Old Testament biblicism which is apparent in the church of the third and fourth centuries?

It is not possible here to enter into a full discussion of these problems. But a few remarks must be made, particularly with regard to Lietzmann's thesis.

✓ (1) The recognition of a polarity, or dualism, between two types in the primitive eucharist seems to me to be one of the most valuable positive results of Lietzmann's investigations. I had accepted a similar hypothesis as a starting-point for my own studies, before Lietzmann's book had appeared; indeed, the present work is largely an attempt to trace such a polarity all through the history of the eucharistic rite. But, as has been stated above, Lietzmann's reconstruction of the history of the eucharist in the New Testament period seems to me untenable. If the Markan narrative of the institution is independent of Paul, and goes back to the primitive Christian community at Jerusalem, it follows that the "Pauline" type existed before Paul, just as the type of the simple eucharistic common meal existed after Paul, as the *Didache* shows.

✓ (2) Undoubtedly from Paul onwards there is a tendency to emphasise the memorial of the passion, to the relative neglect of the "eucharistic" aspect—a tendency which is manifest not only in *Hippolytus*, but also in the mediæval Roman church, and has been carried to its extreme in some forms of modern Lutheranism. But in the Pauline churches themselves the background and the setting of the sacramental rite must surely have been forms derived from the synagogue. Our knowledge is certainly altogether insufficient to enable us to reconstruct a liturgy such as may have been in use in the Apostolic age, either in the Pauline churches themselves or in the others; but it is unlikely that these two groups were divided by a sharp line. Thus, though no doubt we find in *Hippolytus* the development of a tendency which is evident in Paul, it is probable that the forms of worship in the Pauline churches were much more "Jewish" than that of *Hippolytus*—so far as real "forms" can have existed in a time of prophetic ecstasies and charismatic freedom.

(3) As Bousset, Oesterley and Lietzmann have pointed out, the *Sanctus* is derived from the worship of the synagogue, where it is a prominent feature of the daily service, and is called the *Kedûshah* (sanctification); [1] it occurs in three places, attached to the third benediction of the *Tephillah* (or *Shemôneh ʻEsreh*, the eighteen benedictions), after the *Yôtzer* which was a part of the *Shemaʻ* proper in the morning prayer, and at the end of the *Tachanunim.* The undisputed fact that the *Sanctus* was derived from this source seems to indicate that it was introduced into the Christian rite at an early date, before the kinship of the church with the synagogue had been forgotten; for it is hard to believe that the church of the third or even the fourth century would have borrowed from the synagogue. Now the *Sanctus* is quoted by Clement of Rome as from the Christian liturgy. Lietzmann thinks that it is quoted from the liturgy of the daily prayer, taken over from the synagogue, but this supposition is quite arbitrary; there is really no reason why the *Sanctus* should not already have taken its place in the central Christian service—except, of course, for the isolated instance of the anaphora of Hippolytus.

(4) The uniqueness of the formula of Hippolytus in this respect is a very remarkable fact.[2] Lietzmann admits that

---

[1] The *Kedûshah* of the synagogue, as it has been preserved, consists of two Old Testament passages: "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. vi. 3); and "Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place" (Ezek. iii. 12). The idea of the context, as in the Christian liturgies, is that the earthly congregation joins in the heavenly *Kedûshah*.

[2] It would be still more so, if Oesterley (p. 145 f.) were able to prove that Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 12, Migne, P. G. ix, col. 511) quoted the words of Isa. vi. 3 as part of the liturgy. But this appears to be a much less clear case than that of Clement of Rome.

it is so remarkable a fact that it would be natural to suppose that the *Sanctus* was here deliberately omitted; but he supports his theory by adducing three instances of Latin masses in which it is absent, one from the Gelasian Sacramentary and two from Gallican sources. But these cases are far from convincing. They are all much later than the ancient liturgies in which the *Sanctus* regularly occurs, and they are all forms adapted to special occasions—the benediction of oil, baptismal water and candles. The easiest explanation seems to be that in these instances the special formulæ of benediction have ousted the *Sanctus* from the rite; and its absence would be less felt, because these services were not congregational in the strict sense. The formula of *Hippolytus* is also adapted to a special occasion, the consecration of a bishop, and it goes on to the benediction of oil. The universality of the *Sanctus* is indeed hard to explain if its introduction does not go back to the time when the framework of the service first became fixed; that is to say, a time long before Hippolytus, and perhaps not much later than the end of the first century. It is not likely that Jewish elements were incorporated into the eucharistic rite later than the time when the union of the Jewish service of Scripture-reading with the Christian communion-service produced the classical type of eucharistic liturgy.

(5) Finally, with regard to the subject-matter of the eucharistic prayer, the soteriological type of anaphora, represented by *Hippolytus*, is scarcely likely to represent an early stage of the development. The affinity of the cosmological anaphora (such as we find in an expanded form in the Clementine liturgy) with the prayers of the synagogue tells in favour of the greater antiquity of this type.[1] Further, the earliest indication which we possess of the subject-matter of the eucharistic prayer definitely points in the same direction: this is the passage already quoted from Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 41.[2] The thanksgiving for the creation is also implied even in the formula of *Hippolytus* ("qui est Verbum tuum inseparabile, per quem omnia fecisti et bene placitum tibi fuit"); but here the thought is linked with the doctrine of the Logos in a way that suggests theological reflection rather than a primitive style of prayer.

On the whole the evidence seems to me to indicate that the formula of *Hippolytus* represents, not the type of congregational service commonly in use towards the end of the second century, but the work of an individual who deviated from the traditional form under the influence of a Pauline theology, and of a reaction against the Jewish elements in the liturgy, and thus took the passion and the atonement as his dominant ideas; and that, with regard to the subject-matter of the eucharistic prayer, the Clementine liturgy is really more primitive than *Hippolytus*.

---

[1] See Oesterley, p. 137 ff., who finds here a remarkable correspondence with the thanksgiving in the *Kiddûsh*.

[2] See p. 20.

The note of thanksgiving, which originally found its chief expression in the anaphora, came to set its mark also on other parts of the service, and filled it with praise from end to end; till in course of time other elements, especially the idea of the sacrifice, ousted the element of thanksgiving from its central place in the eucharistic prayer. Thus the Church Orders, following a tradition which dates from the earliest days, contain directions for a thanksgiving to be said over gifts in kind; "early canons," says Bishop Gore,[1] "suggest that a Christian eucharist in the first age must have frequently resembled a modern harvest thanksgiving." In the mass of the faithful, the act of communion naturally gathered round itself acts of thanksgiving; as, for instance, in the chant which followed the bishop's words, "Holy things to holy persons," in the Clementine liturgy: "One is holy, one Lord Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father, who is blessed for ever," upon which follow the first words of *Gloria in excelsis*, and the *Benedictus* and *Hosanna*. Naturally there is also a thanksgiving after the communion.

Again, with the development of the Mass of the Catechumens, the note of thanksgiving appeared in the liturgical forms which surrounded the Little Entry, especially in the Byzantine liturgies; it rings out in the *Trishagion*: "Holy God, holy and mighty, holy and immortal"; it finds a symbolical expression in the long ritual of the offering of incense, at the beginning of the liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites.[2] It appears in the acts of praise at the reading of the Scriptures in the liturgy of St. James; the Epistle is greeted with *Alleluya*, the Gospel is preceded by the offering of incense, and followed by a doxology; the use of psalms between the lections is as early as Tertullian. But it was in the West, as we shall see in the third chapter, that the note of praise found its fullest expression in the Mass of the Catechumens.

---

[1] *The Body of Christ*, p. 172. Cf. Maclean, *Ancient Church Orders*, p. 41.

[2] Brightman, p. 75.

2. Communion and Fellowship.

The eucharist has from the beginning been a *κοινωνία*, *communio*, fellowship, both between each Christian and his heavenly Lord, and of Christians with one another. In the early church these two aspects stood in no sort of opposition, nor should they to-day; for it is of the essence of the eucharist, that union with the Lord and union with the brethren are inseparable from one another. It is only for theoretical purposes that the two aspects can be separated, as we are compelled to separate them here; for the former aspect must be reserved for consideration under the heading of Mystery, in the fifth section of this chapter.

The aspect of communion-fellowship, like that of thanksgiving, belongs originally to what we have called the wider circle of eucharistic ideas. The common meal is found in all religions and in all human societies;[1] it was specially developed in Judaism, and it is not improbable that the "breaking of bread" of the primitive church may have grown naturally out of the common ritual meals of the Apostolic circle. But it is the special characteristic of the narratives of the institution that they set forth the Lord as present in the midst of the gathering, and unite the social fellowship of the brethren with the Master's self-oblation. The Synoptic accounts are full of the thought of fellowship: "they all drank" of the cup, which was the symbol of the new covenant—but it was a covenant "in my blood." The eschatological view-point also comes in: those who were there united in the communion of his blood should hereafter be reunited in his Kingdom. In Acts ii. 42 the word "fellowship" occurs in connection with the "breaking of bread." Paul develops the thought of fellowship into the doctrine of the body of Christ: "we being many are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. x. 17); and this is something very much deeper than a mere symbolical description of the association of Christians in the church. In the Fourth Gospel the thought of fellowship is less prominent than that of Mystery. But even if some of the passages which refer unmistakably to the eucharist are individualistic in character, it is probable that both in the allegory of the True Vine and in the High-priestly prayer sacramental fellowship is definitely in mind.[2]

---

[1] Goguel, *L'eucharistie*, Appendix I: Les répas réligieux en dehors du christianisme.

[2] See below, p. 57.

Already in the New Testament we can discern a certain anxiety to assert the importance of unity in the central act of worship, as, for instance, against the tendency to cliques and parties at Corinth; and at the end of the century, in Clement and Ignatius, the problem is evidently acute. Doubtless the cause is, in part at least, the mere increase of the congregations in size; the obvious practical difficulty of holding a supper for two hundred guests must have hastened the transformation of the eucharist from an actual meal to a ritual act.[1] Meanwhile teachers like Clement and Ignatius were insisting that the only valid eucharist is that over which the regular ministers of the church preside. Clement[2] compares the Christian service to the ministry of the Jewish high-priest with his special functions, and the sacrifice that could only be offered at the one altar. For Ignatius, the maintenance of unity is the prime necessity that explains his demand for obedience to the bishop,[3] and it is the condition of the validity of sacramental grace; for it is when Christians come together in unity that Satan's power is brought to naught. Doubtless this sense of the importance of sacramental unity contributed powerfully to the growth of the monarchical episcopate.

In the *Didache*, communion-fellowship finds a very memorable expression: "As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains, and being gathered together became one, so may thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom" (chap. 9). Here the thought of unity has widened out to embrace the whole church scattered throughout the Roman empire; the eschatological viewpoint is still prominent. It is probable that this prayer is based on a Jewish original; perhaps, as Oesterley thinks, on the tenth benediction of the *Shemôneh 'Esreh*.[4]

The thought of fellowship is scarcely less prominent in Justin. The eucharist includes and unites all the baptised; and those who are not able to be present at the service share in the holy gifts, and so in the fellowship of the brethren, by the ministry of the deacons. The fact that the needy can count on material support is a relic from the time when the eucharist was linked with an actual supper. In Justin, then, the sacrament is the seal of membership in the church's fellowship, and the act of confession of the common faith; to be a communicant is synonymous with membership in the church.

---

[1] Cf., however, Batiffol, *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive*, II. p. 157: the eucharist was from the beginning only "un semblant de répas," even though held in connection with a meal.

[2] I. chap. 40.

[3] *Ad Ephes*, 20, etc.

[4] P. 131. There are also parallels in the ritual for the Day of Atonement.

The link between eucharist and *agape* was not easily broken. We have valuable material for the ritual of the *agape* in the *Church Order of Hippolytus* and the *Canons of Hippolytus*, which are to a large extent an extract from the *Church Order*. At the *agape*, which is called δεῖπνον κυριακόν, and takes place in a private house, the bishop or another of the clergy presides. The bread is blessed with a prayer of thanksgiving, and is distributed to the faithful who are present, but not to the catechumens, who receive instead " exorcised " bread. Everyone present blesses his own cup before he drinks. In the canons two kinds of *agapæ* are mentioned, the ordinary δεῖπνον κυριακόν and the meal " where remembrance is made of the departed."[1] Thus it appears that as the emphasis on the element of Mystery in the eucharist became more pronounced, it left to the *agape* some of its significance as an act of fellowship; the communion of the holy mysteries was now more emphasised than the communion with the brethren. We must also notice that fellowship with the departed stands in this *agape*-ritual side by side with fellowship with the living; and the same idea recurs in the celebration of the martyrs' anniversaries.

There is, however, no doubt at all of the fundamental importance in the early church of the idea of fellowship through communion, in spite of the fact that it is not particularly prominent in the patristic writings on the eucharist. Modern studies have generally concerned themselves with the development of the doctrine of the sacrifice; and there is room for a new investigation of the subject from the point of view of unity through communion. We cannot attempt such a detailed study here; but it may be remarked that the idea of unity lies at the back of the writings which developed the idea of the catholic church in the middle of the third century. When Cyprian puts forward the episcopate as the symbol and instrument of the church's unity, there lies behind his legal conception the same idea that we found in Ignatius, that the episcopate is the guarantee of the validity of the sacrament and of unity through the sacrament.[1] And again, the system of public penance testified to the value set upon fellowship in the church, as well as to the need of guarding the sacraments from profanation; at the same time it also obscured to some extent the positive element of sacramental *communio*.

---

[1] Lietzmann, p. 197 ff. Völker's theory of the late origin of the *agape*, which he believes to have come into being during the conflict with Gnosticism (*Mysterium und Agape*, p. 120), is entirely inconsistent with the obvious affinity between the *agape* as we find it, *e.g.* in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, and Jewish common meals. This affinity cannot be explained (as he tries to do, p. 192) simply by the literary influence of the Old Testament; for the ritual directions and the prayers used at the *Kiddûsh* and on similar occasions are not to be found in the Old Testament. They were the living possession of the Jewish community, and were ultimately codified in the Talmudic literature. We have then still to regard the Jewish common meals as the background both of the eucharist and of the *agape*.

The thought of communion-fellowship is far from absent from the early liturgies; it is not to be expected that it would find as full an expression as that of the sacrifice and the mystery. The epiclesis of the Latin text of the Anaphora of Hippolytus reads as follows: "we beseech thee that thou wouldst send thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of thy holy church, and gathering them together in one, give to all thy faithful who partake thereof, unto fulfilment with thy Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify thee through thy Servant Jesus Christ."[2] Probably we have here a reminiscence of the prayer for unity in the *Didache*, which was evidently a very favourite passage. It occurs again in Serapion in a remarkable way, actually separating the two parts of the recital of the institution. After the words over the bread, there is an offering of the bread as a likeness of the Lord's death, and a petition for God's mercy, and then: "as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be one, so also gather thy holy church out of every nation and every country and every city and village and house, and make one living catholic church."[3] Traces of the same prayer appear in the intercession of the liturgy of St. Mark,[4] in the litany at the beginning of the mass of the faithful in the Clementine liturgy,[5] and probably also in the Gallican mass; but not in the Roman.

However, this is an instance in which the verbal forms are of less importance than usual; and the service of the early church was permeated from end to end by the sense of fellowship in common praise. We may fix on three points at which it finds particular expression: the common prayer, the kiss of peace, and the communion itself.

---

[1] See Bernard, "The Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry," in *Essays on the early history of the Church and the Ministry* (ed. Swete), esp. p. 237 f.

[2] For the Latin, see p. 62 below.

[3] From Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, p. 86.

[4] Brightman, p. 126.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 10.

Justin lays stress on the common prayer as a feature of the service; in his account of the mass of the newly-baptised he mentions an act of common prayer before the kiss of peace, and in his sketch of the Sunday mass, after the sermon; and in both passages, an act of common prayer and thanksgiving in the *missa fidelium*. In their fully-developed form we meet these prayers in the Clementine liturgy, in the litany form and led by the deacon as usually in the East. They are the prayers for catechumens and others before their dismissal; the *ektene*, or comprehensive prayer for the church; and after the epiclesis an intercession led by the bishop, and another led by the deacon. In the litany, the Eastern liturgies, and the Gallican,[1] possessed a form of prayer in which the sense of fellowship could be stimulated through the active part taken by the congregation. Frequently also the litanies were said in the vernacular. The disappearance of the litany-form from the Roman mass is one of the symptoms of the weakening of the note of fellowship in the rite which was to become supreme in the West. We may note also the fact that here the Lord's Prayer is said by the priest alone, whereas in the East the people join in.

In the Kiss of Peace the liturgies preserve a feature which was originally not confined to the eucharist. It is mentioned half-a-dozen times in the New Testament, and in Tertullian and other second-century writers. Justin places it immediately before the offering of the gifts. Several liturgies provide a form of words for the Kiss of Peace. The Clementine liturgy has a simple formula; to the bishop's greeting, "The peace of God be with you all," the people reply, "And with thy spirit"; the deacon then says, "Greet one another with an holy kiss." The liturgy of St. James adds a prayer "that we, being pure from all guile and all hypocrisy, may be united with one another in the bond of peace and love."[2] The Gallican rites have as usual variable forms. Nothing can be clearer than that this usage is a symbolic expression of the people's spiritual fellowship; and it is worth noting specially that this ancient rite lasted from the earliest days to the dawn of the Middle Ages, when its character was changed in the West by the substitution of the kissing of the pax-tablet, and its removal to a place after the consecration. This placing of the Pax is a characteristic of the Roman mass; it is mentioned in the letter of Innocent I to Bishop Decentius of Eugubium. Here again one is tempted to see something symptomatic.

---

[1] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 198 ff.

[2] Brightman, p. 43.

We may note also at this point that when the Creed was added to the mass it took its place in the immediate neighbourhood of the Kiss of Peace, either after [1] or before.[2] In the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, after the priest's greeting, "Peace be with you all," the deacon continues, "May we love one another, that unitedly we may confess"—here the choir joins in—"the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the essential and undivided Trinity." Here then it is less the spiritual fellowship of the congregation that is in mind than their unity in the orthodox faith against heresy. But in the sects we find real sectarianism; Novatian made his adherents swear at their communion that they would not go over to Cornelius.[3]

But the act of communion was from the very beginning the chief expression of the sense of Christian fellowship, and the act itself was more expressive than any words. During the whole of the period before Constantine, it seems that the communion of all the people was an integral part of every mass, just as it was quite exceptional [4] for the sacrament to be received outside the service; when the deacons in Justin's account take the sacrament to the sick, this means that they also share in the fellowship of the public service. The third-century Fathers, and the Church Orders, all take the general communion for granted; and the *Apostolic Constitutions* even prescribe the order in which various grades of people should receive: after the bishop, the presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, and the other grades of the clergy; the ascetics in a group by themselves, among the women the deaconesses, virgins and widows; lastly, "all the people in order." [5] Daily communion seems to have been common during this period.[6] Cyprian recommends it; and Hippolytus wrote a treatise (now lost), *De eucharistia an accipienda quotidie.*

---

[1] *E.g.* St. Mark, St. Chrysostom.

[2] St. James.

[3] Eusebius, *H.E.* VI. 43; Srawley, *Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 175.

[4] As when in the third century the Host was taken by people to their homes.

[5] The words of administration are given: "The body of Christ," "The blood of Christ, the cup of life," with the response "Amen." During the communion, in this as in several other liturgies, Psalm 33 (34 in our Bible) is ordered to be sung, clearly on account of ver. 8: "O taste and see how gracious the Lord is."

[6] See, for this subject in general, the articles on "Communion" in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, and in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

But after Constantine, signs of a slacker practice begin to appear. It becomes necessary to give out the notices before the communion; a council at Antioch in 344 condemns the practice of attendance only at the first part of the service; in the latter part of the century we hear of some who communicated only once a year; and it seems to be common in the time of Chrysostom to assist at the mass of the faithful without communicating. The actual disappearance of the communion of the people from the Sunday mass in the West is marked by the shrinking of the communion-psalm to the fragment which remains in the Roman mass of to-day; this process begins to appear in the missals from the eleventh century onwards, but in some places communion-chants of some length are still to be found as late as the fourteenth century.[1] We shall return to this subject in the next chapter.

Two further notes remain to be added in conclusion. First, the phrase added to the Apostles' Creed, "et in communionem sanctorum," may very probably have had a double meaning from the beginning: "the communion of the saints," and "the communion in holy things." The latter meaning seems to be primary; yet the phrase is hardly intelligible as a part of the creed, unless the thought were also present of a community hallowed by common participation in the holy gifts.

Second, the idea of unity is more prominent in Augustine than in any other of the Fathers. For him above all the eucharist is "the sacrament of unity."[2] Interpreting the words "Give us this day our daily bread" of the eucharist, he says,[3] "The power which is here referred to is unity, that we, being incorporated in his body and made his members, may be that which we receive." For the faithful are Christ's body, as the Apostle said; "if then you are the body of Christ and his members, then that which is on the altar is the mystery of yourselves; receive the mystery of yourselves. You hear what you are, and you answer 'Amen,' and confirm the truth by your answer; for you hear the words 'The body of Christ,' and you answer 'Amen.' Live as a member of the body of Christ, that your Amen may be truthful." He goes on to use the old picture of the many grains in the one bread, and adds the corresponding thought of the wine made out of many grapes; "so the Lord has signified to us that we should belong to him, and he has hallowed at his table the mystery of our peace and our unity"; and "he who receives the mystery of unity, and does not keep the bond of peace, receives not the mystery for his salvation, but rather as a witness against himself."[1] But examples could readily be multiplied. Here as elsewhere the great Father has given a fresh actuality and a pregnant form of expression to the noblest thoughts of the early church, which, though forgotten by his own age, remained as an inheritance upon which a later generation should enter.

---

[1] Cabrol's *Dictionnaire*, Vol. III. 2, col. 2436.

[2] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Vol. V. p. 159. Batiffol, *Études*, II. 426 f. Dorner, *Augustinus*, 263 ff.

[3] Sermon LVII. Migne, Vol. XXXVIII. col. 389.

3. Commemoration, or the Historical Aspect.

There is a strong tendency in some quarters to-day to emphasise the mystical side of the eucharist, to the neglect of the historical and rational elements. It is therefore important for us to see clearly that these elements were by no means neglected in the early church.[2] It forms, in fact, the fundamental difference between the heathen mysteries and the Christian, that while in the cult-legends of Isis, Attis or Mithra, not even the best will in the world could find a grain of historical truth, the Christian mysteries commemorate the historical facts of a human life whose essential actuality no sober critic can doubt.

We have then to consider the historical element in the eucharist; the commemoration of Christ, and specially of his passion and death. But we have also to see how in other ways the liturgy relates itself to history, and thereby places in their true historical perspective the central facts which it commemorates; and further, how the structure of the liturgy is itself a monument of the history of Christianity.

The occurrence in the Lukan account of the institution of the words "Do this in remembrance of me" shows that the idea of commemoration was consciously present to the Apostolic church; and their absence from Matthew and Mark can hardly have any real significance. The fact that these evangelists give the record of the institution shows that they believed Jesus to be the founder of the eucharist; and they must necessarily have thought of it as celebrated in memory of him, his passion and his death. But for them it was no more commemoration of the past; more vivid and more important was the thought of Jesus as present, and as the Lord who would come again. So too with Paul: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

---

[1] Sermon CCLXXII. Migne, Vol. XXXVIII, col. 1247 f.

[2] See pp. 53 f. below, and Casel, *Das Gedächtnis des Herrn in der Liturgie* (Ecclesia Orans).

Yet it is perhaps no accident that the Pauline account, by its double repetition of the words "Do this," lays more emphasis than the Synoptists upon the celebration of the memory of Christ's death. It was not indeed he who first made the connection of the eucharist with the death of Christ; but, as the texts lie before us, it is the Pauline account which shows most clearly the centre round which the still fluid eucharistic ideas of the primitive church were more and more to gather.

The Fourth Gospel stands in marked contrast with Paul at this point. It is doubtless an exaggeration to deny, with Réville, that there is any connection in this Gospel between the eucharist and the death of Jesus; for the words about eating his flesh and drinking his blood would be unintelligible if Calvary were not in the background of the picture;[1] and again, the portrait of the Jesus, whose presence the evangelist knew in the eucharist, is dependent on history at the very least for its outward form. Nevertheless, it is evident that the cross is less emphasised in this eucharistic teaching than in the Pauline, just as the historical element generally has less significance in the Johannine world of ideas than in the Synoptic.

In Acts, the notices of the breaking of bread make no mention of any commemoration of the passion; but their extreme brevity makes it illegitimate to argue that no such commemoration was made. The negative conclusion is more plausible in the case of the *Didache*, where there is no reference to the passion and death of Christ, and indeed no commemoration of the life of the Saviour at all; in this case the *Didache* lies nearer the circumference than the centre of the circle of primitive church ideas about the eucharist. But it is really an illegitimate inference from silence to conclude that the ideas which mark the Synoptic records of the institution were wholly alien to the author of the *Didache*:[2] nor is it wise to press a similar argument from silence in the case of Clement of Rome and Ignatius.

In Justin, however, the historical element comes out with all the clearness that could be desired. In the *Dialogue with Trypho* (chap. 70) he speaks of "the bread which Christ commanded us to use in remembrance of his incarnation for the salvation of those who believe on him, for whose sake he endured his passion, and the cup which he bade us drink with thanksgiving in remembrance of his blood." Perhaps it is no mere accidental connection which he here makes of the bread with the incarnation, and the chalice with the passion. In his sketch of the liturgy in the *Apology* he introduces the record of the institution, but does not follow closely either the Synoptic account or the Pauline; thus the command to repeat the act precedes the words of institution; but he gives as the source of his account that which the Apostles handed down in "the memoirs which are called Gospels." The record of the institution occurs in the explanation of the meaning of the rite, in chap 66; but it is not stated in so many words that it formed part of the liturgy. It is, however, wholly unjustifiable to conclude, with Wetter, that in Justin's day the words of institution were not used in the liturgy; this is in no way implied in his language, and the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels at one end of the chain and the consensus of the liturgies at the other render it altogether improbable.[1] The narrative of the institution is found in every liturgical text, with one exception, the Nestorian liturgy of *Addai and Mari*;[2] it must be remembered that the recital of the institution was not regarded at this period, and is not regarded in the East, as effecting the consecration. Their all-but-universal occurrence bears witness that the commemoration of the passion was an essential element of every eucharist—even though the Cross was thought of primarily as a present or an eternal fact.

---

[1] Batiffol, II. 85 ff.

[2] Réville, p. 56.

But, as Justin shows, the commemoration of the history will not allow itself to be limited to the passion; it endeavours to embrace the whole Incarnation. First, the anamnesis in most liturgies summarises the story of redemption, often carrying it on to the second coming, as in the Clementine liturgy:[3] "Remembering therefore his passion and death and resurrection and ascension into the heavens, and his future second advent, when he cometh in glory and power to judge the living and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works." It has almost become a creed; but an actual commemoration of the main events of the Gospel story is made in the latter part of the eucharistic prayer, before the words of institution, and so a place is found at the living centre of the eucharist for the life of Jesus, as well as for his incarnation and his death: "He was holy in his conversation, and taught in accordance with the law; and he drove away all manner of sickness and all manner of disease from among men, and wrought signs and wonders among the people. He who feedeth the hungry, and filleth all things living with plenteousness, partook of food and drink and sleep. He manifested thy Name to those who knew it not; he put ignorance to flight, rekindled piety, fulfilled thy will, and did finish the work thou gavest him to do."[1] However, the Clementine liturgy is unique in its fullness of detail at this point, as also in its recital of the Old Testament story.[2] We cannot here go into the question of its antiquity; but we may remind ourselves that it is just this long recital of the story of God's mighty works, from the creation to the Cross, that provides the parallels which Drews has sought to trace with liturgical material in Clement of Rome, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and elsewhere. That the concentration of attention on the Cross gradually drove out the more extended commemoration of God's works in history would seem on the face of it to be more probable than the opposite process.

---

[1] See the Additional Note at the end of this section.

[2] Brightman, p. 285; Srawley, p. 127.

[3] Brightman, p. 20, and art. "Anamnèse" in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire.*

Ultimately, it was chiefly in the Catechumens' mass that room was found for the wider historical perspective; and this primarily in the Scripture lessons.[3] We cannot here go into the history of these lessons; they were reduced both in number and in length, till we reach the selections of Epistles and Gospels with which we are familiar. But it is certain that there was originally an Old Testament lesson before the Epistle: this custom, which appears in the Clementine liturgy, the Armenian, and the Gallican, was once universal. The reduction of the lessons to two was perhaps a gain in practical convenience, but at the cost of a serious loss of historical perspective; the Old Testament lessons were valuable both for the sake of their subject-matter and because they formed a link with the ancient service of the synagogue. Many later liturgies have suffered another serious loss of Old Testament material in the omission of the psalms from the mass. When the evangelical churches set to work in earnest to reconstruct their liturgies on sound lines, the revival of the prophetic lesson must be seriously considered.

---

[1] From Linton, pp. 37, 38.

[2] P. 22 above.

[3] See art. "Lessons in Liturgy" in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*.

It is necessary to emphasise at this point the inestimable value of the preservation of Scripture-lessons in the Christian liturgy. The remains of the rational and didactic service of the synagogue stood in the Christian service side by side with the sacramental mystery. So long as this was the case, Christian piety could never quite slip its moorings in Scripture. We may even ask ourselves what the fate of the Scriptures themselves might have been if the needs of the liturgy had not compelled men to take thought for their preservation.

Again, the sermon also contributed to strengthen the bond between the eucharist and the Bible, so long as it remained homiletic and expository, as it was in the hands of an Origen or a Chrysostom. It is a fact of the very greatest importance that throughout the early church period the sermon retained its place in the chief Sunday service; and even when allegorical interpretations did more to obscure than to set forth the historical facts, and mystical explanations took the place of exegesis, even so the sermon constituted a rational and didactic element at the threshold of the holy mysteries. Any estimate of the early church service which does not take full account of this fact is bound to be misleading.

Once again, the very structure of the liturgy is in a true sense a monument of Christian history. Attempts have been made to find parallels between the ritual of the Passover and the Christian liturgy. Bickell,[1] after finding the origin of the mass of the Catechumens in the morning service of the synagogue, and illustrating the point with a striking series of parallels, goes on to derive the *missa fidelium* from the ritual of the Passover Feast, taking as his basis the Lukan account in its longer form; the cup in Luke xxii. 17 is then the fourth of the *Hallel*-cups, and after this the *Hallel* (Pss. 115–118, and 136) would be sung. The interesting part of this construction is, that there really is a certain parallelism between Ps. 136, with its praises of God's glory in creation, and his redemption of Israel (answered by the refrain, "for his mercy endureth for ever"), and the eucharistic prayer of certain Christian liturgies, especially the Clementine.

It is, however, very far from certain that the Last Supper was really the Passover-feast; and it is wisest to leave this question open. But the connection of the eucharist with the

---

[1] *Messe und Pascha.* See Srawley, p. 10 ff.; Fortescue, *The Mass*, pp. 70–75.

Passover does not rest on that very doubtful ground. It was a true instinct which led both Paul and John to speak of the Lord as the true Paschal Lamb; and for Christians the facts of his death and resurrection had given a new meaning to the Passover. In this way the ancient Semitic feast, with its roots in primitive religion, survived in Christianity; for Christians it had found its fulfilment in the events whose commemoration was the central point of the eucharist.

Thus the parallel between the 136th Psalm and the anaphora of the Clementine liturgy still remains real, even if the Last Supper was not the Passover. But it is only one link among many between the eucharist and Jewish ritual. There are without doubt connections with the ritual of Jewish religious meals; this is clear from the *Didache*, and from that point the line can be traced to the developed liturgies. The washing of the priest's hands at the beginning of the *missa fidelium*; the prayer in the liturgy of St. James said over the offered gifts, the blessing of the first-fruits of the harvest in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VIII. 40)—all these have Jewish antecedents. The preface and the eucharistic prayer may be compared with the " great blessing " at the end of the Jewish meal. The *Sanctus* with its introduction, the *alleluya*, the *Hosanna*, are all forms whose Jewish origin can fortunately not be doubted. The eucharistic prayer itself can, as we have seen, be related to the 136th Psalm sung at the Passover. The intercession in the anaphora of the liturgy of St. Mark may be Jewish in origin. Finally, the psalms sung during the communion, particularly the 34th, were used also at the Jewish table-ritual. In many of these cases it may well be doubted whether there is really a direct liturgical connection between the Jewish ritual and the Christian; but that there is a considerable number of forms which are common to both admits of no doubt at all. Our estimate of the closeness of the connection in the case of the eucharistic prayer depends chiefly on the antiquity assigned to the anaphora of the Clementine liturgy. If we are right in regarding it as in all essential features very ancient, the conclusion is, as was suggested above, that there was a tendency in the early centuries to a weakening of the historical element in the liturgy, in proportion as more and more emphasis was laid on the central fact of the Cross and on salvation through Christ, as a reality of present spiritual experience more than as a fact of past history.

There remain, however, two other factors which tended to maintain the historical element in the liturgy and enrich it with fresh material. The first was the development of the church's year. The Jewish feasts adopted into Christianity tended to emphasise its historical side; so did certain other Scriptural commemorations of indisputably historical character, notably the feasts of the Apostles. But it is specially interesting to see how the church's own history came to be included in the historical perspective of the liturgy, chiefly through the festivals of martyrs; the historical basis remained even when it was all but concealed by the growth of legend. But this side of the element of commemoration could not be fully realised till a system of proper lections gave its special character to each festival, and room was made for a variable element in the liturgy itself. Both these changes were achieved in the West, as we shall have opportunity to see in the next chapter.

The second point is the reading of the Diptychs, and this is common to East and West. The use of lists of names of the living and the dead who deserved to be remembered is probably very ancient;[1] from the time of Augustine and Chrysostom onwards we have detailed information, and most of the liturgies provide a place for the reading of the diptychs. In the West the list of names of the living seems to have included those who made their offerings at the service;[2] that of the dead might include the list of the bishops of the church, as at Constantinople, and persons renowned for holiness; so "to canonise" meant originally to insert a name among those read in the canon of the mass.[3] In the East the diptychs were generally read at the intercession after the anaphora, in the Gallican rites before the Kiss of Peace. In the Roman rite they were included in the canon; but clearly the commemoration of the Saints has somehow become divided in two, in the *communicantes* and *nobis quoque peccatoribus* of the canon.

Doubtless in this case also the purely historical aspect was not much in mind; the idea was rather to ask prayers for those whose names were read, or else to be assured of their prayers, or be helped by the thought of their invisible presence at the altar. But even when the past is valued chiefly as being in some sense present, yet the Christian eucharist has in fact retained the sense of the past, as past, and it has given to the historical perspective of revelation a place in the eternal " now " of faith.

---

[1] See art. "Diptyques" in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire*. But Bishop (*Liturgica Historica*, p. 113) believed the Diptychs to have been introduced at Jerusalem in the fourth century.

[2] As Innocent's letter to Decentius of Eugubium shows.

[3] For an interesting example of commemoration of the dead in the Nestorian liturgy, see Brightman, pp. 276–81.

Additional Note on Wetter's Altchristliche Liturgien*: Did the words of institution form part of the primitive eucharist?*

Wetter maintained that the words of institution were not part of the liturgy for the first two centuries. The eucharist—as a sacrament—was a mystery-rite like the heathen mysteries. It had its cult-god, and its myth; the words of institution were the ætiological cult-legend added to justify the rite. Our sources also contain references to a religious meal with no mention at all of the passion; as in the " breaking of bread " in Acts, John vi, the *Didache*, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and (as he argued) Justin. Finally, the liturgy of *Addai and Mari*, which omits the record of the institution, preserves a relic of the ancient tradition.

We are for the moment concerned with Justin. Wetter argued that Justin's circumstantial reference to the source of the words—" the memoirs which are called Gospels" —would be unintelligible if he heard them used in the liturgy; he cites them " to support the Christian belief about the eucharist, but not in such a way as to suggest that they had any direct connection with the eucharistic solemnity."

But it is in no way remarkable that the words should not be mentioned in Justin's sketch of the service; and his mention of the source is at once thoroughly typical of his general style, and readily intelligible in view of the fact that he is writing for a non-Christian public. The Gospels were historical documents, accessible and known to outsiders; whereas it is certain that there was as yet no such thing as a developed liturgy, even if the general scheme was fixed, together with a few traditional forms of prayer.

Further, the evidence of the developed liturgies is overwhelming in its unanimity. The anaphora leads up to the words of institution in Hippolytus, Serapion, everywhere, with the solitary exception of the Nestorian liturgy of *Addai and Mari;* for the fact that they are not mentioned in Cyril's *Catechesis mystagogica*, V. cannot imply that they did not occur in the liturgy with which he was familiar. It is indeed possible that *Addai and Mari* may represent an ancient type in which the words were absent; in that case it is a lingering relic, in a backwater of the church, of a view of the eucharist in which the Memorial of the Passion was not a central feature.

Wetter's chief argument is that in some liturgies—*e.g.* the Armenian—the connection of the words of institution with their context is rough and abrupt, and suggests that they were interpolated into an already existing formula. We cannot examine this point in detail here; but we may suggest that an alternative explanation is easy. The recital of the institution was so imperatively demanded by tradition and liturgical sense that it was necessary to include them even when it was difficult to fit them in neatly. The fact that the eucharistic prayer has very various forms, often adapted to express some special theological idea, only makes it the more impressive that it includes the words of institution practically without an exception, and suggests that they were regarded as indispensable. In general, that which is fixed and invariable has the best claim to antiquity.

4. The Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The idea of sacrifice is common to all religions; but the special ways in which it found a place for itself in Christianity constitute a problem with which we cannot deal here. Let it be said, however, that in this case as in others origin is no test of value; in this case as in others Christianity has adopted forms from outside sources, and put into them a meaning of its own; and if the origin of sacrifice in primitive religious ideas has not rendered it unfit to express the doctrine of the Atonement, there is no a priori reason why it should be inadmissible in the sphere of worship. But here we meet at the start a special difficulty. For Christianity there is but one sacrifice, that of Calvary; and if the eucharist is also a sacrifice, it would seem to follow that the one sacrifice must somehow be repeated. This is essentially the same difficulty as that which historical study had to meet in the effort to explain the origin of the eucharist: How is it possible to understand the repetition in the church of the action of the Saviour which belonged to the night in which he was betrayed? It is peculiarly important to deal with this question of the Christian sacrifice on grounds of principle.

But we must first glance at the historical antecedents. Judaism passed on to Christianity a host of sacrificial ideas: sacrificial meals and other religious meals; the sin-offering of the Day of Atonement; the symbolism of the Temple ritual, the glory of the altar, the solemnity of the sacrificial worship; the reflection of all this in the Scriptures, especially in the Psalms; the Paschal sacrifice itself, so closely connected with the death of Jesus, and (whether the Last Supper was the Passover or not) with the origin of the eucharist; all this exercised the deepest influence on the interpretation of the Christian mystery of redemption, and of the eucharist itself. And finally, the prophetic criticism of the legal righteousness of the sacrificial system, and the prophetic call for the sacrifice of a troubled spirit, could not fail to awaken a responsive echo in those who had learnt from the Master that the true worshippers must worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

This background of Old Testament ideas makes it peculiarly difficult to trace the ideas of sacrifice in the primitive eucharist. Sacrificial terms lay ready to hand, and were freely used, but in a new sense; and this uncertainty in the meaning of the terms makes it especially hard to determine at what point a definite idea of eucharistic sacrifice first emerges. It is impossible to make the rite instituted at the Last Supper into a sacrifice (in the ordinary sense), except by rendering "Do this" as "Offer this"; an interpretation which is quite needless, even though there is no doubt that the word ποιεῖν sometimes bears this meaning.

But what is the actual place of the idea of sacrifice in the record of the institution itself? This: that the action of Jesus interprets his death as a sacrifice—"My body which is given for you"—"my blood, which is shed for you." We saw in the first chapter that to regard the institution as an "acted parable" is far from adequate to express its whole meaning; but even so, the idea of the acted parable gives us in principle the "memorial-aspect" of the eucharist. That of which memorial is made, that which is set forth, is the sacrifice of Calvary, both in the act of Jesus at the supper and in the eucharist of the church; and here we have the undeniable evangelical basis of the sacrificial aspect of the eucharist. Admittedly there is in the eucharist no sacrifice in the ordinary sense; there is no material immolation to be accepted by God, no oblation to propitiate his wrath. We may say that it is a prayer-in-action, an enacted prayer, of immeasurable depth and intensity; a dramatic act of commemoration and thanksgiving for God's own act of sacrifice. If then it is true that the primitive church knows of no other sacrifice than the sacrifice of praise and prayer, the term must include the enacted as well as the spoken praise and prayer. Finally, the act of sacrifice acquires its full meaning through the part taken by the congregation. Union with the crucified Saviour, realised through communion, gives the faithful a share in his sacrifice, and so makes the Act of Memorial an actual sacrifice—a sacrifice which finds its fulfilment in a life lived after the pattern of the crucified Master.

Such is the evangelical idea of the Christian sacrifice: such is the spiritual level of the original idea of the eucharist. But in course of time the idea was to be drawn into the sphere of sacrificial religion in general, and thereby to be gradually transformed.

The fact that the general treatment of sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews does not include a definite and unambiguous application of the idea to the eucharist proves at least that no theory of the eucharistic sacrifice held any central place in the writer's thought. It would be rash to insist on a eucharistic interpretation of x. 29: "who . . . hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing"; and the phrase in xiii. 10, "we have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle," has been very variously interpreted.[1] But the idea of sacrifice which occurs a few verses later is quite unambiguous: "Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (xiii. 15, 16).

In the Fourth Gospel the idea of oblation is overshadowed by that of the heavenly food, but its presence is felt in the background: "the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world" (vi. 51).

It is in the *Didache* that the word sacrifice (*θυσία*) is first used of the eucharist; not indeed in the prayers, but in the exhortation to confession of sins before the breaking of bread, "that your sacrifice may be pure"; and no one who has a quarrel with another may partake, "lest your sacrifice should be defiled" (xiv. 1). But as the phrase is simply an echo of the "pure offering" of Malachi i. 11, its occurrence here proves no more than the magic power of the language of the Bible. Clement of Rome (I. 40, 41) uses Old Testament words like oblations, altar and priesthood, which suggest that he sees in the Christian liturgy something corresponding to the Temple ritual. Ignatius speaks of the "one altar" (*ἓν θυσιαστήριον*) in connection with the one eucharist, but he abstains from using sacrificial language, even when we might expect to find it, to relate the eucharist to the one sacrifice of the cross.[2] Definitely sacrificial language is found in Cyprian; and Harnack's statement that till his time there is no idea of a sacrifice except that of praise and prayer seems to be generally accepted, even by some Roman Catholic writers, such as Renz and Wieland, at least as regards the period before Irenæus.[3] Yet the use of Old

---

[1] Réville (p. 70): No one eats of the Christian altar, for the only Christian altar is the self-oblation of Christ on Calvary. O. Holtzmann: The epistle was written to exclude a sacrificial interpretation of the eucharist, cf. v. 9: "it is good that the heart be established by grace, not by meats." This is criticised by Goguel, p. 219. Batiffol and other Roman Catholic writers, on the other hand, find in the verse a direct reference to the eucharist: Batiffol, *Etudes*, II. 109–15.

[2] Réville, p. 39. Cf. Wieland (*Mensa und Confessio*, p. 40 ff.), who states that in the primitive church "altar" has only a symbolical meaning. This book has been violently attacked by the Jesuit Dorsch.

[3] Recently Völker (*Mysterium und Agape*, p. 132 and elsewhere) has emphasised the sacrificial language used of the eucharist in early times.

Testament language constantly involves ambiguity; thus Justin can at one and the same time say that praise and thanksgiving are the only sacrifice acceptable to God,[1] and take the offerings made by lepers for their cleansing as a type of the sacramental bread, and the "pure offering" of Malachi i. 11 as a type of the eucharistic oblation.

Clement of Alexandria knows of no material oblation in the Christian service; for him the only sacrifice is prayer and praise and the sanctification of life.[2] In all essentials Tertullian follows the same lines.

With Irenæus we reach a new stage, in which the bread and wine are clearly stated to be sacrificial offerings. This is part of his whole view of the sanctity of the material creation; that which God has created is not unfit to be offered to him. "We offer to him that which is his own, thereby declaring the unity of the material and the spiritual. For as the bread which comes from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God (*percipiens invocationem Dei*), is no longer common bread, but eucharist, consisting of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, which receive the eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have hope of immortality."[3] The controversy against the Gnostics also urges him to make a close connection between the Incarnation and the sacrament; and in this he prepares the way for the later doctrine of the sacrifice. "The hallowing of the creature" is his key-phrase, which he uses both of the Incarnation and of the Christian sacrifice of praise.

This use of sacrificial language for the material gifts offered at the altar, rather than for the prayers and praises of the people, is clearly reflected in the liturgies, as, for instance, in the directions of the *Apostolic Constitutions* for the gifts of the people to be received by the deacons and offered at the altar. We have also the oblation of the gifts immediately before the epiclesis in this liturgy: "We offer to thee, our King and our God, according to his institution, this bread and this cup; giving thanks to thee through him that thou hast deemed us worthy to stand before thee and to perform our priestly ministry . . ." Even Wetter[4] recognises that the Clementine liturgy here represents a more ancient point of view than the others. The offering of the gifts is made at the central point of the mass, and the bread and wine are

---

But he seems to take the expressions which the church borrowed from the Old Testament in too literal a sense.

[1] *Dialogus*, 117: cf. *Apol.* I. 13.

[2] Wieland, p. 48.

[3] *Adv. Haereses*, IV. 18. 5.

[4] *Op. cit.*, II. p. 17.

offered in their natural substances, while the "we-form" of the prayer includes the congregation in the act of offering.

In the later liturgies that which is offered is not the bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ; it is the priest who offers rather than the people; and the old offering of the gifts is transferred to a place outside the *missa fidelium*, and sometimes, as in the prothesis-ceremony of the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, treated as a symbolic representation of the sacrifice of the cross.[1] It is doubtless right to say, with Wetter, that it is the belief in the real presence as localised in the elements that brought the idea of the sacrifice into close connection with the consecration, and made it dependent on the priest rather than on the congregation. This brings the idea of the Christian sacrifice sensibly nearer to that of non-Christian religions. It is not primarily now the prayer and praise of the church that are offered at the altar, nor the gifts of bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ in the material form of the sacred elements. By the popular mind the priestly act was easily thought of as possessing in itself a mysterious power of propitiating God, of making an impression on God, by the sheer force of sacred rite and "magical" word. In so far as this was the case, it is right to speak of a "paganising" of Christian worship. Yet the whole development would surely have been impossible if the idea of the showing-forth of the one great Sacrifice had not been present in the eucharist from its origin in the Gospel.

Cyprian is the earliest writer who expresses this view of the sacrifice, in his distinction between the *oblatio* offered by the faithful and the *sacrificium* hallowed by the operation of the Holy Spirit.[2] Yet he does not fully develop the idea, and he does not treat the sacrifice as having any independent value of its own; "the passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer." It can be offered for others, but only in virtue of the intention of the prayers, not on any magic power in the act itself. At the same time it is true that a dangerous step has now been taken towards assimilation to the pagan idea of sacrifice. The priest's rôle has become more important; he is necessary to the rite, he acts in Christ's name, imitating what Christ did. In course of time the inference was bound to be drawn by popular piety that the priestly act had an independent value of its own, and the danger had become real that it should be regarded as an act intended to propitiate God's wrath, and available for the benefit of the dead as well as for the living.

---

[1] Brightman, p. 356 f.

[2] Wieland, p. 55.

For Origen the offering of Christ in the liturgy, like all other outward acts, is symbolical; the stress is laid, not on what is done by the earthly priest, but on the eternal sacrifice of the great High-priest at the heavenly altar. This thought occurs also in Irenæus, and in several of the liturgies; chiefly, however, in the form which it takes in the *Supplices te rogamus* of the Roman canon, which prays for the acceptance of the earthly gifts at the heavenly altar, that the heavenly gift of God may descend to the altar on earth.[1]

Among the later Fathers, Ambrose and Augustine contributed most to the deepening of the idea of the sacrifice. For them both, Christ himself is the one sacrifice, which the sacrifice of the liturgy can only bring to mind and set forth, while its fruits are received in communion. For Augustine especially the priestly act has value only in connection with the communion of the people; and this is the surest safeguard against the degradation of the act to a pagan level. He teaches that the eucharistic sacrifice is the Memorial, the showing forth, of Christ's death. In this supreme act, the church of the redeemed partakes in his sacrifice, as members of the body of which he is the head. Here the thought of communion-fellowship comes in; there is complete identity between the ideal church and the body of Christ, and this identity is expressed in the sacrament. The church, as being Christ's body, is itself offered in sacrifice: "this is the Christian sacrifice—we who are many, are one body in Christ."[2] This involves the sanctification of the church and of its members; they are pledged to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God (Rom. xii. 1).

We shall consider in the next chapter the special development of the idea of the sacrifice in the Roman mass. We may, however, note here that the Roman doctrine at its best scarcely goes beyond the patristic view. Modern Roman writers often emphasise with all the clearness that could be desired that the sacrifice of Christ is the one sacrifice, which can never be repeated; and that the eucharistic sacrifice consists in this, that through the consecration the one sacrifice is made present, and by this means man may appropriate and enter into the sacrifice of Christ. Only symbolically, says Wieland, can the mass be called a sacrifice offered by man; for in reality we have nothing to give to God; it is ours to receive. So the American Bishop Bellord[1] writes that the sacrifice of the mass consists essentially in the act of communion.

---

[1] Cf. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 184 ff.

[2] *De Civitate Dei*, X. 4. Cf. Gore, pp. 203–9, who quotes the Leonine Sacramentary, "Propitius quæsumus Domine hæc dona sanctifica: et hostiæ spiritualis oblatione suscepta, nosmet ipsos tibi perfice munus æternum." Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, I. 122–4.

Yet it is only a short step to the treatment of the mass as a human act of offering. There is one sacrifice, the perfect obedience of Christ on Calvary; but the priestly act makes it specially and newly present. The one sacrifice is like the sun, but it has planets revolving round it; and the many masses have a reality of their own. And, again, there are always two sides to the Roman view; while theological thought endeavours to maintain the idea of sacrifice on the high levels of Christian faith, popular piety tends ever to relapse to an essentially pagan conception. Yet it must not be forgotten that the post-Tridentine church has succeded in avoiding any definition of the sacrifice of the mass, and even to-day great latitude is allowed to Roman theologians on this point.

To attempt to uproot from the eucharist the sacrificial ideas which have been associated with it throughout its history must involve a serious loss, and a narrowing of the eucharistic idea. The way to guard the evangelical fullness of eucharistic doctrine is not the "reducing-method" of Puritanism. The eucharist is menaced at every point, not at this point only, by the danger of degradation to a pagan level; and the danger becomes serious whenever any of the aspects of the eucharist is held in isolation from the rest. The effective defence is therefore the maintenance of all the aspects in their completeness and harmony.

The evangelical churches must treat seriously the consideration that the eucharist is a sacrifice of praise; and they cannot be justified in denying the validity of the idea of the Memorial-act. This idea is implied in the Augustinian and Lutheran teaching that the sacrament is the "visible word," not only in regard to the individual's communion, but to the service as a whole. This is to regard the sacrifice as an "enacted prayer," the solemn act of the church, appealing to the sacrifice of Calvary, and showing it forth before God. There can be no danger of losing hold of evangelical truth so long as the sacrifice is not separated from the communion. The two thoughts, held together, lead to the profound Augustinian conception of the church's self-oblation through Christ, which we shall see bearing fruit later on in the churches of the Reformation.

[1] *Catholic Encyc.* art. Mass, Sacrifice of the.

5. Mystery and the Presence.

The heathen mysteries and the Christian.

When Christianity appeared in the Græco-Roman world as a religion with one sacred rite of initiation and another of communion, the language of the day had a term ready to describe them: they were Mysteries. Justin's observation is well known, that the Mithraic cult had a rite not unlike the eucharist, and that it was the work of the evil spirits (*Apol.* I. 66. 8). But the manner of his reference shows that he was conscious of a difference between the Christian and the heathen rites; and the fact that outsiders like Lucian [1] describe Christianity in the phrases used of the mysteries is no proof of an identity of nature.

The word "mystery" is used in the Septuagint of the secret counsels of kings and military commanders; [2] in the Synoptic Gospels, of the secret of the Kingdom of heaven; [3] in the Pauline epistles, of the counsel of God.[4] It is used by the Alexandrines of the hidden meaning of Scripture, and of the truths of faith, hidden from the uninitiate, and from their time onward language borrowed from the mysteries is freely used; Justin can speak of the mystery of the cross, and Tertullian uses the Latin *sacramentum* in the same sense, though the Latin word seems to have conveyed the further idea of a sacred oath. But it is not till the fourth century—specially in Ambrose and Chrysostom—that baptism and the eucharist are called mysteries. It is to be noted that this usage becomes common at the time when the liturgies begin to show traces of the influence of the mystery-cults; and the fact that in the earlier period the use of the word "mystery" for the two Christian rites was avoided may serve to show that there was felt to be an essential difference between them and the heathen mysteries.

The attempt to derive baptism and the eucharist directly from heathen rites is now seen to be one of the freaks of historical scholarship and a symptom of a childish ailment, which is not uncommon in young sciences.[5] To-day this theory appears only in the popular expositions, whose mission seems to be to grant a further lease of life to the less fortunate hypotheses of real scholars. Serious discussion is now confined to the date and the extent of the influence of the mystery religions on the Christian sacrament.

---

[1] Anrich, *Das antike Mysteriewesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, p. 109.

[2] Judith ii. 2, Tobit xii. 7, 2 Macc. xiii. 21.

[3] Mark iv. 11 and parallels.

[4] Rom. xvi. 25, Ephes. iii. 9, Col. i. 26, and other passages.

[5] Clearly, however, there is always the possibility of regression. This seems to be the case with P. Smith, *A Short History of Christian Theophagy* (Chicago, 1922).

It is true that in these as in other heathen religions there were rites not altogether unlike the eucharist. But the likeness often disappears on closer investigation; often, again, our knowledge of the mystery-cults is late in date and incomplete. We know very little about the sacred cup (*kykeon*) of the Eleusinian mysteries;[1] the Bacchanalian devouring of raw flesh, in which the life-force of the divinity was supposed to be present, belongs to a very different world of ideas from the Pauline and Johannine. For the Mithraic rites we have only Justin's allusion and a bas-relief which tells us next to nothing of their real meaning;[2] we know little better what it was that the worshippers of Attis "ate off a drum and drank out of a cymbal"; and there is only a fragmentary inscription to give us an inkling that there were perhaps food and drink in the worship of "the great gods" at Samothrace. There is no sacred meal of which we know anything like so much as of the Christian; and the little that we know serves chiefly to bring out the contrast.

If we would gain a positive idea of the relation of the heathen mysteries to the Christian, we must take a different line. There was in the ancient world a hunger and thirst for communion with the divine and for salvation, which prepared the way for the entrance of the mystery-cults from the East, and which also confronted Christianity with a demand for the satisfaction of its longings; and the challenge could not be refused. Christianity had something to give very different from what the cults of Serapis, Attis or Mithra could offer; it had a "salvation-myth" which was rooted in the firm ground of history, an intenser religious devotion than any other cult, and a stronger ethical savour than Mithraism. In coming to the succour of the men of the Græco-Roman world it was exposing itself to new influences; but does it follow that its character was altered because it clothed itself in a new dress?

The mysteries of the earlier classical period, standing in sharp contrast with the chilly formalism of the state cere-

[1] Cf. Casel, *Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier*, p. 23 f.

[2] Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 102. A summary of the extant material is given, with comments, by Völker, *Mysterium und Agape*, pp. 212–23. Cf. also Angus, *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*, pp. 127 ff.

monials, had offered the worshipper a personal religious experience of union with the mystery-god. In the ecstatic wildness of the worship of Bacchus and Cybele, in the mysterious liturgy with its sacred emblems and ritual, there was the sense of the presence of the cult-god in the midst of the worshippers; there was an intoxicating delight when the mystic rite made the cult-legend move out from the grey mists of the distant past and become living and actual in the present, and the god came to unite his worshippers with him. "Attis, Osiris, Adonis were men, who died and rose again as gods. . . . If we can become united with them, receive them into ourselves, or clothe ourselves with them, we have the most certain assurance of our own immortality, even our deification."[1] So a personal piety became possible: "Thy divine features, thy sacred virtue, I will hide in my inmost breast, I will guard continually and keep ever present to me."[2] To actualise this union with the god the cult needed a liturgy; and we have every reason to believe that such existed, even though at best only fragments are known to us. The liturgy needed a priesthood, different in kind from that of the state functionaries; for the disciple stood in a relation of spiritual sonship to the priest from whom he had learnt the sacred teaching, and called him father. Finally, mystical initiation united all the faithful in a universal fellowship, independent of race or social standing, though never attaining a stability comparable for a moment with that of the Christian church.

All this stood in the strongest contrast with the old Græco-Roman religion, and scarcely less with Judaism; the piety of the mysteries, together with ideas ultimately derived from Plato, prepared the way for the development in the early church of a religious type characterised by the idea of the Divine Immanence. There was no reason why Christianity should not enter in by this door, and set its melody in the mystical, immanental key; there was much for Christian religion to gain in fullness and richness—provided always that it never lost its mooring in the revelation of the transcendent God, and provided that men never forgot that the Lord who was present in the Christian rite was the Jesus of Galilee and Calvary. It is with good reason that a writer belonging to the Benedictine liturgical movement[3] has called the mysteries "die Vorschule Christi." But such a phrase can only be used with a double qualification: first, that the mystery religions are for us no simple and readily intelligible entity; rather they are a heterogeneous manifold, known to us only in a few scattered fragments; and it is barely possible for a laborious investigation to show how the influence of unifying religious forces was able in some measure to produce spiritual values of a higher order out of this heterogeneous material. And second, it is impossible to fix time-limits for this process of transformation, in which it is clear that the essential factors are Oriental in origin; thus we have no absolute standard to distinguish genuinely Christian and evangelical elements from those which are derived from Hellenistic syncretism. But the absence of such a standard will cause no difficulty to those who are able to take a positive, constructive view of the nature of revelation.

---

[1] Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (2nd ed.), pp. 6, 9, 18. Casel, pp. 28, 35.

[2] Casel, p. 39, after Apuleius, *Metam.* xi. 25.

[3] Casel, *op. cit.*

There can then be no objection to calling the eucharist a mystery in the wider sense. But it is quite another matter when the attempt is made to show that it is a Hellenistic mystery in the technical sense; the attempt fails so soon as the inquiry comes to grips with details. This might be illustrated from Wetter's attempt [1] to show that the primitive eucharist was simply a mystery-cult, in which the cult-legend consisted of the passion of Jesus, his death, and his victory over infernal powers. Wetter was compelled by this theory to regard the mystery-language of the liturgies as dating from the earliest period of all. Now it is true that Wetter and other students of comparative religion have provided a most useful corrective to the over-rational view of Liberal Protestantism; they have been alive to the presence of enthusiasm and ecstasy, where earlier scholars could visualise nothing more than a decent and orderly congregational worship. But they have assuredly sought to prove too much. At any rate, for those who have no ready-made theory to justify, it would be most natural to conclude that the most ancient elements in the liturgy are the Jewish—that is, broadly speaking, the Scriptural and rational elements. The thanksgiving for God's mighty works and the social fellowship of the religious meal are beyond all doubt particularly typical of the primitive eucharist; and it is only by ignoring these, as Wetter does, that it is possible to make out that the early eucharist was a mystery-rite in the technical sense. It may, in fact, be asserted with the greatest confidence that the direct influence of the

[1] *Altchristliche Liturgien:* I. *Das Christliche Mysterium.*

mystery-cults on the eucharist did not begin till a much later period.

What then are the chief points of contrast between the Christian and the pagan mysteries?

The fundamental difference, which no forced comparisons or accidental resemblances must be allowed to obscure, is the difference between myth and history. In both cases the worshipper finds help from the contemplation of the past as present to faith in the ritual act of worship. But while in the one case the "past" is a cult-legend of Attis, Isis or Mithra, in which not even the best will in the world could find a grain of historical truth, in the other it is the story of a human life whose essential historicity no sane critic can for a moment doubt.

Therefore the attitude of the religion to its "myth" must be in either case different. The heathen religion is bound to seek to free itself from the ideas, often very gross and sensual, out of which it grew up;[1] we may remind ourselves how union with the deity was often conceived in the form of sexual intercourse, and how this feature reappears in certain Gnostic rites.[2] Probably the higher piety of the mystery-religions did not reach its full development till their meeting with religious philosophy, particularly Neoplatonism, from the end of the second century; but whether this be right or not, the holy actions and images tended to be treated as symbols, and the mystical experience to concentrate more and more on the inward, less on the outward.[3] Yet the earthliness of this mystical piety was so strong that it imposed on its reformers the element of magic theurgy from which the dying philosophy of the ancient world could never shake itself free. But the Christian mystery had no need to seek to spiritualise itself by getting rid of its "myth." On the contrary, a return to its historical origins has always been for it a way of cleansing and renewal.

Again, the normal relation of the mystery-cults to one another was one of tolerance.[4] Especially in the later period, the accumulation of mystical initiations was the common practice; it was prudent to acquire as many guarantees of salvation as possible. Philosophy saw in the various rites only different ways of approach to the one Deity. But it was on the ground of intolerance, from first to last, that Christianity fought and won. It was unthinkable to partake of the Lord's table and the table of devils.

---

[1] Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 251.

[2] Reitzenstein, p. 22 f.; Fendt, *Gnostische Mysterien* (1922). The descriptions in this book of rites and practices, which in many cases are really repulsive, give an idea of the extent to which the Christian Mysteries in the church did *not* become paganised.

[3] Anrich, *Das antike Mysteriewesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, pp. 23, 55.

[4] This principle is not disproved by partial exceptions; as when the worshipper of Isis promised to refrain from the rites of non-Egyptian gods. Reitzenstein, p. 15.

It would be easy to draw up a whole list of points of contrast, which make it impossible to class the Christian mystery as one of the mystery-religions. Whenever a definite piece of information about their ritual emerges, it is generally something that points a contrast with the Christian church. This holds good even of those elements which the church borrowed from them, such as the *disciplina arcani.* Later Fathers observe silence about the details of the Christian liturgy; but there was evidently no such rule known to Justin.

Let us then define, by contrast, the Christian Mystery. In the eucharist the Christian apprehends the presence of his Lord and Saviour (who is at once the historical Jesus, the Jesus of Galilee and Calvary, and the eternal Christ, unlimited by time and space) in all the power of his completed work; and through union with him, in the fellowship of the brethren, becomes partaker of the salvation that he has won. Consequently the eucharist sums up the Christian faith and the Christian religion with a fullness which verbal definitions can never adequately express.[1] Definitions are but approximate attempts to clothe in words the Christian experience of faith.

Mystery in the New Testament.

The Christian mystery has two poles or foci, which are already clearly discernible in the New Testament. We may call them the Synoptic and the Johannine types, if we see that the ideas to some extent overlap. The first is the thought of the Saviour as personally present at the eucharist; the second, the thought of the sacred elements as channels of Divine power and grace. It must be added that the line was perhaps never very sharply drawn between the presence of the Lord at other times, when the two or three are met in his name, and his sacramental presence; but it is with the latter that we are specially concerned.

---

[1] Cf. some words of W. R. Inge: "When we receive Holy Communion we express our belief that the mysterious Divine presence, of which we are conscious in prayer . . . is not only God, or the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of Jesus . . . we are identifying the living well-spring of our faith, the source of our hope and our happiness, the guide and inspirer of our lives, with a historical character who lived nearly two thousand years ago" (*Speculum Animæ*, p. 17).

We begin, then, with the thought of the presence of the Lord at the eucharistic meal. The meal at Emmaus may serve as a type to show how the primitive eucharist united with the experience of social fellowship that of the presence of the Risen Lord in the midst, the Lord who had been visibly present at the Last Supper. The elements are his body and blood; they symbolise the presence of the Crucified, and they constitute a link with his passion.

This brings us to the records of the institution.[1] In the Synoptic accounts Mystery finds expression in the equation of the bread with his body, the wine with his blood. Even if we were to give the phrases a purely symbolic meaning—"this represents my body"—the act of consuming the symbols would lead beyond the region of symbolism to that of Mystery. As we have seen, the ideas of sacrifice and of communion-fellowship are inseparable from the action, particularly in the Markan record; in Luke and in Paul the idea of the Covenant predominates with regard to the chalice. The primary aspect, however, is that of communion with the Lord. We need not again discuss the complicated problems connected with the accounts, and it will be permissible now to sum up the element of Mystery therein contained, in the following theses:

(1) In the eucharistic meal there is the experience of the presence of the Lord and of communion with him.

(2) The presence is associated with the bread and wine, and is defined by the way in which Jesus himself used these elements at the Last Supper.

(3) Hence any physical identification of the bread and wine with the material flesh and blood of Jesus is impossible, even apart from the Jewish sentiment, which viewed the drinking of blood with abhorrence. The words, so interpreted, would be meaningless, since at the Last Supper Jesus was sitting at the table with the disciples; and the copula—*est*, is—which has been taken in some later controversies as proof of a corporeal identity, was certainly

---

[1] Let it be understood that we are here dealing with the ideas of the Last Supper as we find them in their earliest attainable form, in the Synoptic accounts; and not directly with the thoughts in the mind of the Lord himself. We cannot dare to interpret the fullness of his meaning, unless indeed we believe ourselves capable of sounding the depths of his mind.

lacking in the original Aramaic. It is the form which the words take when translated that has contributed to the localising of the presence in the elements.

(4) Yet since the presence is associated with the elements, the repetition of the Lord's action in the church's eucharist makes really present that which his action at the Supper symbolised—his self-oblation to death; and the elements thus guarantee the connection of the rite not merely with the historical Saviour, but with his finished work of redemption.

(5) Hence the act of eating and drinking must express the receiving of the wholeness of his nature, and the fruits of his redemptive work.

The last thesis admits that there is a place in the Synoptic type for the mystical sacramentalism of the other type, in which the elements are viewed as channels of Divine grace. The predominant thought is, however, that of the personal presence of the Saviour, proclaiming anew the mystery of his sacrificial death; as also, perhaps, in the Johannine account of the appearance of the Lord, with the marks of his passion, to the doubting Thomas. This thought of the presence is in accord with the eschatological outlook of the Synoptists; communion is not for them a partaking of the timeless Divine life, but a meeting with the Lord who shall one day come again.

The Pauline view stands in line with the Synoptic. There is somewhat more emphasis on the aspect of Commemoration (" Do this in remembrance of me "), and that of Memorial (" Ye proclaim the Lord's death "); and the eschatological outlook (" till he come ") shows that mystical sacramentalism does not occupy the whole field. At the same time the sacramental element is stronger here than in the Synoptists; the cup of blessing is the communion of the blood of Christ, the bread the communion of his body. It is indeed contrary to the evidence of the texts, as we have seen, to regard the Pauline eucharist as derived from the heathen mystery-religions; yet it may be admitted that the religious atmosphere of the Greek world may have had some influence on him. But also, with the Pauline sacramentalism the thought of communion-fellowship is closely linked: " we who are many are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread." This excludes a material identification of the elements with the Lord's body and blood; for the body of Christ is also the church. Yet this latter is not the whole meaning; it is false to say with Réville that the communion of the blood of Christ is *only* membership in the new covenant which was ratified by his blood. The specially Pauline thought is the union of the mystical fellowship of the church with a mystical incorporation into the crucified Saviour. We may say, then, that in the Pauline view the elements have much the same significance as in the Synoptic.

The Johannine type stands, however, as in direct contrast with the Synoptic-Pauline.[1] Its characteristics may be summed up in the following theses:

(1) The chief emphasis is laid, not on the personal presence of the Saviour, but on the elements as channels of the Divine life. This is shown, negatively, by the omission of the narrative of the institution, and positively by the attachment of the discourse on the Bread of Life to the Feeding of the Multitude, and the emphasis there on the act of eating and drinking. It is the aspect of Communion that is stressed, and not the act of Memorial.

(2) Communion is interpreted as primarily the individual's participation in the Divine life. This individualism is a trait which the Fourth Gospel shares with the genuine mystics of every age. On the other hand, the allegory of the True Vine certainly expresses an organic view of communion, and should warn us against exaggerating the Johannine individualism.[2]

(3) There is a real and necessary connection of the Johannine view with the passion. The Divine quality of the sacred elements depends on the sacrificial death of Jesus, and the phrases of chap. vi. are directly dependent on the words of institution.

(4) "Flesh and blood" in that chapter does not mean either the material flesh and blood of Jesus, or a symbol or figure thereof; rather, the words taken together signify the wholeness of the person of Jesus; "the living bread" is equated first with Jesus himself, then with his flesh. This is the reconciliation of the difficulty of the apparent realism of vers. 53–58 ("he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my

---

[1] See von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, II. 87 ff.

[2] Bernard (*St. John, I.C.C.* I. clxxiii ff.) argues that the allegory of the True Vine in John xv. is connected as definitely with the eucharistic chalice as John vi. with the eucharistic Bread: cf. the Vine of David in *Didache* ix., and the same expression in Clem. Alex. and Origen. Further, while John vi. stresses *faith*, John xv. 1–8 stresses *unity*, and leads up to the ἀγαπὴ which the disciples are to have one for another (ver. 12). It can hardly be an accident that precisely the same thoughts occur in Ignatius: "faith which is the flesh of the Lord, and love which is the blood of Jesus Christ," *Trallians*, 8; and similarly *Romans* 7, *Phil.* 4.

blood ") and the apparent symbolism of ver. 63 (" the flesh profiteth nothing "). Neither a purely realistic nor a purely symbolistic explanation does justice to the Evangelist's thought. For him the mystery of the eucharist is parallel to that of the Incarnation; the Word was made flesh, and both in Incarnation and in Sacrament the spiritual operates through the means of the material. The union of the faithful Christian with the Lord, which is mediated by the sacrament, is of the same nature as the unity of the Son with the Father. Therefore all subsequent incarnational theology can rightly appeal to the authority of the Fourth Gospel.[1]

Thus the Johannine type is dominated by a mystical sacramentalism, or by what we may call the idea of " inflowing " grace. It has become the fashion, especially in modern German theology, to brand this outlook with modern Protestantism's favourite heresy-name, and call it " quasi-physical " or " magical," taking for granted that it is thereby proved to be unworthy to be called Christian. It really seems that somewhat more self-restraint would not be amiss.[2] The question is, whether Christianity can be stated in terms of the immanental-mystical type of religion. May we not say that the Fourth Gospel and the true heirs of its tradition have proved the possibility of such a statement, by anchoring the timeless mysticism of this type of religion to the historical fact of the Incarnation, and that this is what is expressed in the sacramental presence of the Divine life in the eucharistic elements? It must be admitted that this religious type runs a special risk of degradation to something like a pagan level; but the critic of dogma needs to reconsider his premisses very seriously before he condemns that religious spirit which finds its greatest expression in the Fourth Gospel.

---

[1] Cf. Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile*, p. 247; also some words of Gore: " The religion of the Incarnation—the religion of a Christ come in the flesh—associates the lower and material nature with the whole process of redemption, and teaches us that not without a material and visible embodiment is the spiritual life to be realised either now or in eternity. The spiritual, in the New Testament, means not what is separated from the material or the bodily, but that which expresses a spiritual meaning." This view " is of a piece . . . with the twofold nature of man, in which body is associated most intimately with every spiritual faculty, and in which every spiritual emotion and capacity is made to depend upon external and physical facts."—*The Body of Christ*, p. 39.

[2] See an interesting article by K. E. Kirk, " Magic and Sacraments," in *Theology*, Dec. 1925, pp. 319–38.

Mystery in the writings of the Fathers.

It is the Johannine view of mystery that is on the whole most in evidence in the early Fathers. The *Didache* as usual takes a line of its own ; so much so that it has been questioned whether it has any mystical side at all. Réville [1] points out that the elements are not called the body and blood of Christ; on the other hand, Batiffol [2] reminds us that there is evident anxiety to guard them from profanation, and that thanksgiving is made for "spiritual food and drink and eternal life through thy Son" (X. 3). This might be connected with the Johannine texts about the Bread of life. But, so far as the element of mystery exists in the *Didache*, it must surely be rather of the Pauline type, as the prayer for the Church's unity shows. It seems clear, however, that the "Maranatha" of chap. X is directed to the Parousia rather than to the sacramental presence.

Ignatius carries on the Johannine teaching. His well-known phrase, that the eucharist is the "medicine of immortality, a safeguard against death, unto eternal life in Christ Jesus" (*Ad Ephes.* xx. 2), forms a bridge between the Fourth Gospel and the later sacramentalism of the Eastern church. But it must be remembered that the context of these words is an exhortation to unity, in the one common eucharist, celebrated by the Bishop; that is to say, a passage where the leading thought is Pauline. There is thus in Ignatius a certain blending of the Pauline and Johannine types; and even if some passages seem to identify the elements with the Lord's body and blood, this must be taken as qualified by spiritualising phrases which treat them as symbols of faith, love and Christian unity.[3]

Justin's view is closely parallel to that of Ignatius. In his exposition of the meaning of the service (*Apol.* 66) Johannine influence is evident, but any sort of materialism is precluded by the close connection which he makes between the sacrament and the Incarnation; this thought, which must be read between the lines of John vi., is fully expressed in Justin.

It is impossible to give more than the very briefest summary of the development of the doctrine of the real presence in the later patristic period. The early church never formulated its doctrine of the eucharist; and the spiritual reality of the church's worship received interpretations varying according to the theological outlook and the religious insight of the writers. They oscillate between the materialism of popular piety and the symbolism of the theologian, and sometimes the same writer will use both types of phrase almost in the same breath. We must remember, however, that the ancient meaning of the word "symbol" is not the modern meaning; Harnack has taught us that in ancient usage the symbol is not a mere sign, but that the reality is present in the symbol.

---

[1] P. 56.

[2] *Études*, II. p. 67.

[3] As in *Trall.* 8, *Phil.* 4, *Rom.* 7. See, on the one side of the controversy, Loofs, in *Prot. Realencyclopädie*, I. p. 39 f.; on the other, Batiffol, pp. 39–48.

The starting-point for the development of the doctrine among the Greeks is the antithesis of the symbolism of Origen and the dynamic view of Irenæus, according to which the sacrament consists in the addition of a heavenly substance to the material elements. Both these lines of thought have their roots in the Johannine mystery-type. To these Loofs[1] adds a third type, the "symbolic-sacrificial," in which the leading idea is not the communication of the Divine life, but the showing-forth and the appropriation of the sacrifice of Christ, as in Tertullian, Cyprian and the later Antiochene school. So Cyprian speaks of the priest as "imitating that which Christ did";[2] for him the elements are the *signum* or *figura* of Christ's body and blood, while Tertullian prefers the word *repræsentare*. Theodore of Mopsuestia calls the elements "signs of Christ's death," and in Chrysostom similar phrases occur, fragments of Antiochene teaching, side by side with materialistic expressions of the real presence. Thus in this "symbolic-sacrificial" view the Synoptic mystery-type comes back again; stress is laid on the historical fact of the passion, and the element of mystery attaches itself to the sacrificial Act of Memorial celebrated and made, and in a sense dramatised in the service. This is the starting-point for the later Western development of the doctrine of the sacrifice.

In the East, popular piety was essentially Monophysite, and this, especially in a time of Christological controversy, tended to find expression in a materialising view of the presence in the elements. For Gregory of Nyssa they are channels for the inflowing of grace, almost physically conceived. In this way the typical Western and Eastern ideas of the process of salvation are reflected in eucharistic doctrine.

---

[1] *Prot. Realencyc.*, I. 52, 58–61; *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 212 ff.

[2] "Sacerdos id quod Christus fecit imitatur," *Ep.* 63. 14.

But there was also an exchange of influence. The Greek view of the sacred elements as possessing a substantial holiness of their own passed across to the West, and became a decisive factor in the subsequent development, side by side with the Western idea of the sacrifice. Later on, it was the turn of the East to receive the idea of the real presence back from the West in the materialised form of transsubstantiation (μετουσίωσις), and this doctrine in large measure took the place of the less definite conversion-doctrine (μεταποίησις) of John of Damascus, which would otherwise be the final point in the development of the early church in the East.

The starting-point of the Middle Ages in the West was fixed by the two great Latin Fathers, Ambrose and Augustine. The former was wrongly credited with the authorship of the *De sacramentis*, in which the change of substance is expressly taught; but it is not unlikely that he used similar expressions in his popular teaching. Augustine is the foremost example of the way in which apparently contradictory views can exist side by side in one mind; Zwingli and modern Roman apologists both appeal to his authority. Strong realistic phrases abound, such as "The bread which you see on the altar, hallowed by the word of God, is the body of Christ,"[1] but these were without doubt intended by him to be understood spiritually; such an interpretation is demanded by the strong distinction which he makes between *signum* and *res*—thereby creating the terminology of all later eucharistic theology—by his emphasis on the spiritual character of the gift in communion and its subjective conditions,[2] and not least by his mystical view of communion-fellowship, since for him the greatest of the fruits of communion is incorporation into the fellowship of the body of Christ.

Mystery in the liturgies.

We see then, in the Fathers a continual conflict between the demand of popular devotion for a material, concrete expression of the real presence, and the reluctance of theological thought to tie down the heavenly Lord to the categories of space.[3] This materialism is the constant peril of Christian piety, especially where the dominant type is the Johannine; and it is much in evidence in the liturgies.

---

[1] Sermo CCXXVII. Cf. Batiffol's study of Augustine, *Études*, Vol. II.

[2] "Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti."—In *Joh.* xxv. 12.

[3] Cf. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 91 ff.

We shall consider the central idea of the Lord's presence first, before passing to the ceremonial forms which surround it.

In the liturgies, as they stand, the process of localisation seems to be complete. It is in the sanctity of the elements that the mystery consists. In the Eastern liturgies—and probably in all parts of the church in the early centuries—the real presence is regarded as dependent not on the words of institution, nor on the assurance given by the words of administration, but on the epiclesis, the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit, or sometimes the Logos, on the elements. Evidently Irenæus has such an epiclesis in mind when he speaks of the bread receiving the invocation of God, so that it is no longer common bread, but consists now of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly.

The epiclesis in the Latin text of *Hippolytus* reads thus[1]: "Et petimus, ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctæ ecclesiæ, in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem spiritus sancti ad confirmationem fidei in veritate, ut te laudemus et glorificemus per puerum tuum Iesum Christum, per quem tibi gloria et honor . . ." This is a relatively vague form; in *Serapion* we have: "let thy holy Word come upon this bread, that the bread may become Body of the Word, and upon the cup, that the cup may become blood of the Truth." The developed liturgies pray definitely for the descent of the Holy Spirit to hallow the elements; so the Clementine liturgy: "send down thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, upon this sacrifice, that he may make (ἀποφήνῃ) this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ; that all they who shall partake thereof may be confirmed in piety, may receive remission of their sins . . . ." *St. James* is fuller and richer in phrase, but has an addition which is interesting and may be significant: "upon us and upon these holy gifts."

It is probable that the Western liturgies, including the Roman, had originally a similar epiclesis,[2] though in the extant texts we find instead a prayer that God will of the offered gifts make a valid eucharist, as in the *Hanc igitur* and the *Quam oblationem* of the Latin Canon. But it is also possible that other parts of the canon may have had a similar character from the beginning.[3]

---

[1] For an English translation, see p. 30 above. On the various forms of the Epiclesis, see Atchley in *Theology*, 1921.

[2] Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 405.

[3] See Lietzmann's careful investigation in *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 117 ff.

In the later Roman view the moment of consecration was fixed at the reading of the words of institution. In the East, however—in so far as any need was felt for conceiving the heavenly presence in terms of time—the epiclesis was thought of as the consecration, as is evident from the solemnity attached to it in the liturgies, and from allusions such as that in a life of Nestorius,[1] that when the bishop celebrated, the Holy Spirit was then seen hovering over the altar in the form of a dove. It seems that the fixing of the consecration at a particular moment happened first among the Gnostics; [2] and the increase of definiteness in the wording of the epiclesis, which can be seen in the extant texts, suggests that the earlier view of the presence and of the consecration was considerably less definite. The "upon us" of the liturgy of St. James is not the only sign that the epiclesis originally referred to the congregation rather than to the elements.[3] In this liturgy the thought of the coming of the Lord is also associated with the "Great Entry," when the unconsecrated elements are brought to the altar, at the beginning of the mass of the faithful, to the strains of the cherubic hymn: "Let all mortal flesh keep silence, and stand with fear and awe, and put away all earthly thoughts; for Christ our God, the King of kings, cometh to be immolated and to be given for food to the faithful . . ." [4] Other places in the liturgies show traces of the thought of the Lord's coming, or his presence, surrounded by hosts of angels; sometimes immediately before the communion, sometimes at the "Little Entry."

We may also quote a prayer from the Mozarabic liturgy, which is even now not quite disused: "Be present, be present, O Jesus, thou good Priest, in our midst, as thou wast in the midst of thy disciples; sanctify this oblation, that we may receive the hallowed gifts through thy holy angel's hand, O Holy Lord, eternal redeemer." [5] It is tempting to see in this prayer a relic of ancient tradition. The Lord is present at every eucharist as at the first eucharist of all; he it is who through the priest's lips speaks the sacred words, and consecrates afresh the holy gifts to be an effectual symbol of his sacrifice. This thought connects itself naturally with the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews about Christ's high-priestly office; and in his exposition of this epistle Chrysostom [1] dwells on the unity of the earthly and the heavenly sacrifice, and treats the sacrifice of the altar as a participation in the heavenly offering. Ambrose [2] expresses the precise thought of the Mozarabic prayer in the words: "We have seen the great High-priest come to us; we have seen and heard him offer his own blood for us . . . yea, he himself is manifest among us as the offerer, since it is his holy word that hallows the sacrifice that is offered."

---

[1] E. Goeller, *Eine Jakobitische Vita des Nestorius* (Oriens Christianus, I. p. 279).

[2] Srawley, p. 44.

[3] Fortescue, p. 403.

[4] Brightman, I. 41. Cf. *English Hymnal*, No. 318.

[5] Quoted in Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 216. Cf. Gore, p. 100. Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, p. 401, regards this prayer as very ancient; but see also Cabrol, *Les origines liturgiques*, p. 221, and Lietzmann, p. 105.

Thus we can trace in the liturgies, behind the idea of the localised presence—an idea which so often fails to keep the spiritual heights of the Fourth Gospel—the outlines of a more living, more personal conception, rather in line with the Synoptic type. Christ comes, the heavenly Lord, in the midst of his adoring people, to be their priest; he is present in the action as a whole, rather than as enclosed in a "house of bread," or elevated on the altar-throne. Without doubt many a faithful soul in later times has sought refuge from the crudities of materialistic teaching in some such view as this; and it assuredly contains a value which the evangelical churches should not disdain to learn and to use.

Mystery in the practice of the church.

There can be no doubt that the heathen mysteries exercised a certain amount of direct influence on Christian worship, especially in the period after Constantine. There is a clear difference between the second century and the period of the Christological controversies. On the one hand, the mystery-religions were considerably more spiritual than they had been three centuries before; and on the other, the entrance of whole populations into the church brought about a materialising, and to some extent a paganising, of the Christian faith. One side of this process is the growing materialism of sacramental doctrine; the longing of the Græco-Roman world for immortality could feed on the eschatological belief which was native to Christianity, but its relation to a holy substance and to a ritual act could not fail to be influenced by the heathen rites which abounded everywhere. Thus it is first in this period that a crude sacramental materialism seems to make progress, and the "medicine of immortality" comes to be treated in a magical way, especially in connection with the mass for the dead.[1]

---

[1] *In Hebr. hom.* xi. 2, 3. Quoted in Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, I. 118.

[2] In *Ps. xxxviii Enar.* 25 (Stone, I. 119).

But it is much easier to trace the direct influence of the heathen mysteries on the ceremonial of the liturgy than on the ideas connected with it; and their effect on the rite of baptism is even more evident than on the mass. In both these cases the *disciplina arcani*, the veiling of the rite in secrecy, is a prominent feature. It is hard to say exactly when this tendency begins to operate. Certainly Justin has not the least idea that he need make any secret about Christian worship; on the other hand, Tertullian and the early Alexandrines avoid mentioning facts about the Christian liturgy, and their silence may in part be explained by a rule of secrecy. But it is not till the fourth century that the tendency is fully developed; the later Fathers can say that the body and blood of Christ are given in the Christian rite, while avoiding mention of the use of bread and wine.[2] In the liturgies we see how carefully the uninitiate are now excluded from the Mass of the Faithful by the deacon's warning cry.[3] The sanctuary was surrounded with the veil, which has survived in the Ikonostasis of the modern Eastern church, where the "royal door" still has a veil which is used to make certain parts of the action quite invisible to the congregation; and in the hangings which sometimes surround the altar in the Western church.

However strange this whole idea may seem to the modern mind, and however much it may have its roots in primitive religious instincts, it has nevertheless a high religious value;[4] it is an expression for the awfulness of the holy, the *tremendum*, which belongs to all deep religion. The religious purpose becomes more clear when we look at the service itself. At the offertory in the Clementine liturgy it is the deacon's duty to stop all noise. We have already heard the opening of the Cherubic hymn: "Let all mortal flesh keep silence." At the holy of holies of the liturgy, says Chrysostom, "a great silence reigns, when the Spirit bestows his grace, when he descends, when he broods over the holy gifts." The sacred silence, which hushes even the celebrant's voice, is as much a part of the Greek mass as of the Roman.[1] Should anyone be in danger of forgetting the awful presence of the holy mysteries, the communion was preceded by a common act of prostration and adoration, which at least in the Syrian liturgies was one of the most solemn moments of the service. The warning cry of the deacon was heard again, and the priest's voice: "Holy things for holy persons," with the people's reply: "One is holy, one Lord Jesus Christ. . . ." But here we have left behind us the sphere in which external influences are to be traced, and have come to the intense expression of reverence for the holy, which belongs to all deep religion.

---

[1] Anrich, p. 186.

[2] Anrich, p. 165.

[3] So in the Clementine liturgy: Brightman, pp. 3, 9, 13.

[4] Casel, *Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier*, chap. 4, "Das mystische Schweigen."

It belongs to the nature of mystery that it must be surrounded by safeguards to protect it from profanation by unworthy use. While Christianity was bound by an inner necessity to develop such safeguards, their form could hardly fail to be influenced by the mystery-cults. We have seen one instance in the *disciplina arcani;* another is the preparation of the individual for his communion.

The early church could here rightly call to mind the Lord's saying, "Give not that which is holy to the dogs," and the apostolic warning against eating and drinking unworthily. So in the *Didache* there is to be confession of sin before the eucharist, and each is bidden to be reconciled to his brother. The problem is, then, that of the connection of the forgiveness of sins with the eucharist. It is clear that in the early church this matter never took anything like the central place which it gained in the later Roman and the Lutheran churches. It is a problem which still awaits a special investigation; we can here only sketch out the lines on which the solution of it is to be attempted.

It seems that in the primitive church there was no special penitential discipline in connection with the eucharist. Not as sinners but as holy, Christians joined in the sacrifice. So it is in the *Didache*; there is no system of discipline; grievous sinners are without doubt treated as excluded from the church's fellowship. It was evident enough that the faithful themselves could not claim sinlessness, and that they also needed forgiveness; but the confession of sins was put outside the actual eucharist.

---

[1] Here the Christian usage is paralleled not only by the heathen mysteries, but by the longing of the Neoplatonic mystic to escape from the confusion of the noisy world and in silence attain to the Alone and hear his voice. Casel compares the window-scene at Ostia in Augustine, *Confessions*, ix. 25.

But as the penitential system grew, the situation changed. There was now a definite list of sins which excluded from communion: mortal sins, which involved excommunication. The *exhomologesis* had therefore a technical application, to the sinners awaiting their restoration; consequently it was not felt to be fitting to hold a general confession of lighter sins before the mass of the faithful, and the prayers for the forgiveness of the sins of the faithful came to be included in the central part of the service.

The Clementine liturgy here probably represents an intermediate stage. There is a long prayer for penitents at the end of the catechumens' mass, but no confession proper in the mass of the faithful; there is only a prayer that the holy may be preserved undefiled, and there is mention of the forgiveness of sins in the epiclesis. There is no mention of the forgiveness of sins in the epiclesis in the formula of Hippolytus, or in Serapion. But the latter, like most of the later liturgies, has a confession of sins at the beginning of the mass of the faithful; but no absolution. And the thought is certainly present (as in the Liturgy of St. Basil, and Cyril's *Catecheses*) that the forgiveness of sins is bestowed in communion itself.

We shall meet this subject again in our study of the mediæval period in the West,[1] where it was worked out far more fully. In the early church period the problem of the sins committed by the faithful does not in any way take a central place; but the double line was already marked out which the subsequent development was to follow: first, the penitential system, and second, the ethical side of the eucharist itself.

Of the external safeguards surrounding the mystery, which can be connected with the mystery-religions, the chief is the fast before communion. There is evidence for this custom from the third century onwards; the first actual instance is in Tertullian:—"the heathen husband may wonder what it is that his Christian wife receives before taking any other food" (*Ad Uxorem*, ii. 5). It is in the following century that it seems to have become a rule. In the time of Cyprian,[2] evening eucharists were still not unknown, if no longer as the great public service. In one case only—Maundy Thursday—evening communion was regularly practised throughout the church; was the fast required? Canon 28 of the Synod of Hippo (A.D. 393), in enforcing the general observance of the fast before com-

[1] Pp. 91-93 below.

[2] *Ep.* lxiii.

munion, makes an exception of this day; and Cabrol[1] believes that there was still an *agape* before the eucharist on this day, in commemoration of the Last Supper.

The Church of Rome and the Orthodox Church have both preserved in large measure the outward garb of mystery in ceremonial and other traditions; but no church custom can rightly be condemned on the ground of a pagan origin, for the point which matters is, whether the idea which it now expresses is Christian. Again, we need to make a clear distinction between the outward dress and the inward spirit and essence of the Christian mystery. The danger for Protestantism is, that its justifiable opposition to the external form has all too often involved the loss of the inwardness of mystery; and the result has been that the holy rite has sometimes become like an empty shell, not without didactic value, but robbed of its deepest religious meaning. For wherever mystery, the apprehension of the supernatural, is present in living power, it is bound to find for itself some outward expression—as by the solemnity and dignity of the service, or by a "holy silence," full of sacred awe and of meanings which words cannot express, for it is the outward form of the approach of the humble soul to meet its God.

We too, like the early church, have received from the Gospel the universal form of the eucharistic mystery: the presence of the Lord, associated with the bread and wine which are the symbols of his passion and death. Holding fast to this, we do well to follow the example of the early church in avoiding definitions of the mystery, which can never be adequate to the fullness of Christian experience. The real presence is true, not indeed as a physical fact apprehended by the senses, but as a spiritual fact apprehended by faith; and it symbolises and mediates, as no other form can do, the union of the faithful with their Lord, which is the central experience of faith.

But it is of the essence of truths of faith that they are apprehended not as faith's own subjective creation, but as realities in the fullest sense objective; therefore faith demands assurance that the eucharist has its origin in the action of Jesus himself, is directly related to his historical personality, and is the authentic expression of the regenerating force, which emerged in history as the result of his life's work. With regard to this, faith has no reason to fear the results of sane criticism.

---

[1] Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, Vol. VII. col. 2486.

The history of the Christian mystery in the early church may further teach us what are the true safeguards which may save the eucharist from becoming "paganised" and degraded to a level which is not Christian. Chief among these is the maintenance of what we have called the Synoptic mystery-type. This is characterised by the sense of the Master's presence rather throughout the service than locally in the elements, by the interpretation of communion as the expression of fellowship, and by an emphasis on the historical aspect of the rite; we have seen how the distinctively Christian element of the holy mysteries in the church was constituted by their anchorage in history, and how important a part of the liturgy was the mass of the catechumens, and the direct link with the service of the synagogue which was thus preserved. Further, the Synoptic mystery-type guarantees that the Presence is thought of as personal, and also that the ethical demand remains real.

At the same time, it would be an arbitrary narrowing of the evangelical basis of Christian worship to deny a place to the Johannine type, which expresses the reality of sacramental union with God, with a depth and a spirituality which no Christian church can afford to lose. There will be no danger of a false materialism while the Johannine type retains as its corrective the Synoptic type, apart from which its origin would not be intelligible.

CHAPTER III

THE MIDDLE AGES IN THE WEST

The Middle Ages received from the early church a rich but unsystematised heritage. The deepest antithesis is the same which we observed in our study of the Gospel sources: the contrast of the Memorial-aspect and that of Communion. These two elements had been developed on the lines of the Synoptic mystery-type, which had gathered round it the idea of sacrifice and oblation, and the Johannine type, which was predominantly individualistic, and in expressing the idea of a partaking of the Divine nature by means of the sacred elements, tended to lose the fellowship of the primitive religious meal. But it is quite inaccurate either to sum up these two types under the aspects of Sacrifice and Mystery respectively, or to assign the former to the Western and the latter to the Eastern church. From the Antiochene school the Eastern church had gained a clear expression of the idea of the sacrifice; and while it is true that the West emphasised the sacrifice more and more, it united with it an immanental mystery-conception in the doctrine of the real presence in the elements; and the conflict of these two sides, which was never fully resolved either in the theory or in the practice of the Middle Ages, lies at the root of some of the most interesting phenomena of the period.

There is also another conflict, between the crude materialism of popular religion, with regard both to the sacrifice and the real presence, and the constant effort of theological thought to find its way to a more spiritual conception. Both in the East and in the West, and in Augustine[1] perhaps more than any other writer, we find a juxtaposition of the popular materialism and a pure symbolism; on the one side, the realism of the Ambrosian (and pseudo-Ambrosian) writings, with their anticipation of transubstantiation, and on the other, a symbolistic interpretation of the sacrament. But when the forms inherited from antiquity were taken over by the Germanic peoples, the realism of the traditional forms found dangerous allies in the untrained minds and the crude superstitions of the young nations.

---

[1] "If the sacraments did not bear a certain likeness of the realities of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all; and from the fact of this likeness the sacraments commonly receive the names of the realities themselves"—*Ep.* XCVIII. 9; and on the other hand such phrases as "not merely sacramentally but really we eat the body of Christ and drink his blood."—*De Civ. Dei*, XX. 25. See Loofs, *Prot. Realencyc.*, I. 62 f., and Batiffol, *Études*, II. 423 f.

1. The Gallican and Roman Rites.

Of all the factors which went to shape the sacramental piety of the Middle Ages, the most influential was the Roman mass. Already at its first appearance, it fully expressed the distinctive character of the Roman church.[1]

However, the Roman rite, as it emerges fully developed in the Carolingian period and begins to subjugate the West, is composed of a variety of elements, chiefly Gallican, gathered round a core which is genuinely Roman. Here we touch one of the most difficult and controverted problems in all liturgical history: that of the relation of the various Latin liturgies of the West to the Roman rite and to one another. If, as seems probable, we ought to regard the various non-Roman rites, including the Milanese, the Mozarabic, and the Celtic, as members of one and the same family, the Gallican, we have still to face the main problem: whether we should regard this family (with the French Benedictines, Dom Cagin and Cabrol,[2] and also Drews) as the direct and conservative heirs of the oldest liturgical tradition of the West, out of which the Roman rite also sprang; or (with the older English school) as derived from the East, by way of Lyons, or (with Duchesne) from the East by way of Milan in the fourth century. Clearly the historical importance to be assigned to the Gallican rite, relatively to the Roman, depends largely on the answer to this question; and the issue is of importance for constructive liturgical work in the present.

It seems to me that the evidence tells decisively in favour of the French Benedictine school, and against Duchesne. The temporary importance of Milan in the time of Ambrose may well explain the existence of certain peculiarities in Gallican ritual which are probably derived from the developed Oriental rites, for it is certain that some Eastern influence was transmitted to the West by this way; but it does not explain the existence all over Western Europe of a liturgical type quite different from the Roman. It may well be asked what liturgies were in use in Gaul and Spain before this great inundation took place in the fourth century, and why no traces have survived of this "pre-Gallican," that is to say, "pre-Oriental" period. Further, the differences between the several types of the Gallican (including the Mozarabic) liturgy do not seem to point to a definite Oriental form, accepted everywhere in these countries, as their common original. The true inference from the evidence seems to be that it is the Roman rite that has diverged from a common early tradition, to which the Gallican rites have in the main been faithful; though it may be admitted that the Gallican rite, as it is known to us, reflects the development of the fourth and fifth centuries, and includes also later additions. The following pages will, I trust, show further justification for this opinion.

---

[1] For the following, see Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (E. T., *Christian Worship, its origin and evolution*); Fortescue, *The Mass*; Bishop, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, in *Liturgica historica*.

[2] Among the foremost representatives of the younger Benedictine school, the names of A. Wilmart and P. de Puniet in France, and of Odo Casel and K. Mohlberg in Germany, may be mentioned.

It is clear that the Western rites as a whole differ from the Eastern rites in certain notable respects, above all in the variation of the liturgy according to the church's year. This point has been specially emphasised by Dom Cagin and Cabrol.[1] The Eastern rites have in effect one fixed liturgical form, in which only the lections change. In the West, on the other hand, it is only the groundwork which is fixed; the rest of the liturgy is full of variable forms. These are contained in the Sacramentaries, a type of book to which the East has nothing to correspond. The Gallican rite goes furthest in this direction; the invariable portions are limited to such formulæ as the *Sanctus Deus*, *Kyrie*, *Benedictus*, *Sanctus* and the words of institution, and all the rest is variable, even the part which corresponds to the Roman canon. It is important to note how great is the contrast between all Western and all Eastern rites at this point; the Roman rite occupies an intermediate position, accepting the principle of variation, but limiting it severely. It may fairly be argued, as against the theory of Duchesne, that the greater variability of the Gallican rite is likely to be more ancient than the limited variability of the Roman, as being nearer to the freedom of the earliest period; and again, that the great variability of the Gallican liturgies tells very strongly against the supposition that they are derived from the Eastern rites, whose special characteristic is their fixity.

---

[1] Cabrol, *Les origines liturgiques*, p. 354 ff.

It is further to be noted that the Western development of variable texts for the seasons of the liturgical year emphasises particularly the historical side of the eucharist—the aspect of Commemoration in the widest sense. On this account the principle of variation must be regarded as one of the most valuable elements of the Western liturgical tradition.

The points of difference between the Roman and the other Western rites are numerous; but the problem is difficult to fix, because all extant rites bear marks of the interaction of the Roman and Gallican traditions. Only the Leonine Sacramentary is purely Roman; it is a private collection of the variable portions of a number of masses, dating probably from the sixth century, and it consequently lacks the ground-scheme, the *ordinarium missæ*, and the fixed canon. The Gelasian Sacramentary was probably written out in France in the eighth century; it provides the earliest evidence of the arrival of the Roman liturgy upon French soil, and also of its first Gallican modifications. The Gregorian Sacramentary goes back to a missal sent by Hadrian I to Charles the Great in 791; but it received Gallicanising additions from Alcuin and others, which were worked into the text. It is the Gallicanised *Gregorianum* which forms the basis of the later Roman mass.

We must now endeavour to sketch the contrast of the original and genuine Roman rite with the original Gallican rite, even though it is only possible dimly to trace its development from the fourth century to the time of Gregory the Great, when it is certain that the canon had received its final form. In its earliest form the marks of the Roman mass are simplicity and force. The lapidary, weighty brevity of the style makes the creation of the balanced, rhythmical Collect one of the greatest gifts of the Roman spirit to the church of the West.[1] The Roman style is the direct creation of the Roman genius; and if it has the defects of its virtues in a certain tendency to dryness and lack of imagination, it is sharply contrasted with the Gallican prayers, which are at times overloaded with matter, or drop into a homiletic style. The greater exuberance of the Gallican style may, however, justly be regarded as a mark of antiquity. The Roman terseness assuredly represents, not primitive simplicity, but a conscious process of stylistic pruning; primitive simplicity, if there ever was such a thing, is hardly likely to have delighted in the counting of syllables and the careful ordering of cadences. At the same time the Roman brevity accentuated in some degree the sacerdotal character of the service, as though there were a sense that the edification of the congregation was of less account than the liturgical action. Other Roman characteristics told in the same direction, such as the omission of the Litany of the Deacon at the end of the catechumens' mass, a feature which at least gave the congregation an opportunity to take an active part in the liturgy at this point.[1]

---

[1] See especially Bishop, *The Genius of the Roman Rite.*

The early part of the original Roman liturgy was severely simple, consisting only of Introit-psalm, collect, epistle, gradual and *alleluya*, Gospel, secreta; and it contrasted with the richness of the Gallican rite,[2] which had an introit-antiphon, the *Sanctus Deus*, *sanctus fortis*, sung in Greek and in Latin, the *Kyrie eleison*, and the *Prophetia* (*i.e.* the canticle *Benedictus*); there were three lessons, of which the first had disappeared at Rome by the seventh century,[3] with the exception of a few days, when three (or more) lessons are still read in the Roman missal. The reason for this change must have been the desire to shorten the service; the cost was a weakening of the element of Commemoration, a loss of historical perspective. The ceremonial emphasis on the reading of the Gospel was common to both Roman and Gallican rites.

The sermon was originally part of the regular order of the liturgy, but it disappeared at Rome after Gregory the Great. In the Gallican rite the sermon often seems to have consisted in a reading from the Fathers; but from the time of Cæsarius of Arles there was a regular demand for sermons in the French church, and Charles the Great ordered that priests as well as bishops should preach regularly. And since the Litany of the Deacon, which followed the sermon, was commonly recited in the vernacular, as in the East, there was a section in the middle of the Gallican rite which served to the edification of the congregation and stimulated the sense of fellowship.

The Gallican rite also preserved the Great Entry, when the bread and wine and the sacred vessels were solemnly brought in, while the choir sang a hymn of praise; as in some Eastern liturgies Christ was here solemnly greeted as King. Duchesne [1] remarks that "by anticipation the same reverence is paid to him as after the consecration"; but it would be better to say that we have here a thought of the presence which is not localised in the elements or subordinated to the sacrificial action. The offering of gifts in kind seems to have been early relegated to the beginning of the service. The Great Entry was followed by a series of prayers, including the reading of the Diptychs and leading up to the Kiss of Peace.

---

[1] The introduction of the *Kyrie eleison* by Gregory the Great was, however, the return of a rudimentary litany. *Kyrie eleison* is the response in the litany at the beginning of the Liturgy of St. James. The Gregorian Sacramentary has a litany at the beginning of the ordination mass; the Roman rite still has a litany at this point on the eves of Easter and Pentecost, and the Ambrosian rite on Sundays in Lent.

[2] Rietschel, *Liturgik*, p. 312 ff.

[3] Fortescue, p. 257.

This whole section of the Gallican mass corresponded to the Offertory of the primitive Roman rite, which then consisted of the offering of gifts in kind, while the Offertory psalm was sung, and the prayers *super oblata* or *secrèta*. The offertory-act is one of the few features in the Roman mass which are decidedly more ancient in character than the corresponding parts of the Gallican liturgies. The Kiss of Peace had been moved to its place after the Canon by the time of Innocent I, who explains the reasons for the change in his letter to Bishop Decentius of Eugubium. We may regard it as in a manner symbolical that this ceremony, which had originally expressed the brotherly unity of the worshipping congregation, was now subordinated to the ritual action, and made to point back to the consecration rather than forwards to the communion of the people.[2]

In the Preface and *Sanctus* the Western liturgies preserve the scheme of the Greek liturgies, but provide a number of proper prefaces; the Leonine Sacramentary has 267, one for every mass. The Roman rite gradually simplified this exuberant richness of form, till in the Gregorian Sacramentary there are only 10—but the Gallican addition contains over 100 more [3]—and in the modern Roman rite 11. At the same time the pregnant brevity of the Roman style appears here also; the Roman preface for Christmas is about one-third the length of the Gallican.[4] It must be counted as a merit in the Western rites that at this point also the aspect of Commemoration finds fuller expression than in the Eastern liturgies; on the other hand, this gain is counterbalanced by a certain weakening of the note of praise which was characteristic of the Eastern rites, especially of the Syrian, where the song of praise to the Creator still preserved an echo of the ancient Jewish grace before meat.

---

[1] *Origines du culte*, p. 204. Cf. p. 63 f., above.

[2] Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 181.

[3] Fortescue, p. 318.

[4] Quoted in Duchesne, p. 214.

After the *Sanctus*, the Syrian liturgies carry through the note of thanksgiving to the words of institution, the Anamnesis, and the Epiclesis; and the Gallican rites follow the same order, usually beginning again after the *Sanctus* with the words *Vere sanctus*; as we have seen, this part also of the mass is variable. But this order, at once simple, noble and ancient, was replaced at Rome by the Canon, an awkward series of prayers in which even Roman Catholic scholars try in vain to trace a logical sequence of thought. One cannot help comparing it to an ancient house, whose original form has been spoilt by clumsy additions.[1]

This strange liturgical compilation, unchanged in all essentials since the time of Gregory the Great, and surrounded by the awe of the "holy silence," has cast its shadow over the whole eucharistic rite in the West. It is impossible to discuss here the various attempts that have been made to interpret it. Perhaps the most satisfactory theory is that of Drews,[2] who regards the *Quam oblationem* as the original beginning of the Canon, and compares the Egyptian rites (Serapion, St. Mark), where the thought of the oblation is introduced in a similarly abrupt way after the *Sanctus*, and made to lead up to the words of institution. After the words of institution, the *Unde et memores*, ending with a prayer that the oblation might be acceptable to God, was followed by the *Te igitur*, with which the Canon now begins, and this in its turn led to the memorial of the living and the dead (*Memento*, *Communicantes*, *Memento etiam*, and *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*). It must be admitted that Drews has found a more logical order, and can point to striking similarities with the Eastern liturgies.

But in any case it is certain that the original intercessions for the living and the dead have been broken up, and the fragments inserted in different places in the Canon. It is also clear that in some way or other an Epiclesis has disappeared, and various attempts have been made to discover its traces. One theory sees in the *Quam oblationem*, with its prayer that the oblation may be valid, "that it may be unto us the body and blood of thy beloved Son our Lord

---

[1] To maintain the priority of the Roman Canon to the corresponding parts of the Gallican rites seems to me entirely impossible, even though some of its prayers are without doubt very ancient.

[2] *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe* (1902). See also Fortescue, pp. 138–71.

Jesus Christ," a variant of the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit, but placed before the words of institution instead of after them. The normal place of the Epiclesis is, however, after the Anamnesis; that is, after the *Unde et memores*, where now there is an oblation of the elements, and a prayer that they may be taken up to the heavenly altar. In any case it is clear that the Epiclesis has been ousted by the thought of the Sacrifice.

Nothing is more typical of the Roman canon than the constant recurrence of the thought of sacrifice and oblation. Taken separately, perhaps none of its expressions go further than those of earlier formularies; but their cumulative effect is that the thought of the sacrifice becomes, as never before, the living centre of the rite. It attracts to itself all available material in the various parts of the mass. Even the intercessions for the living and the dead are drawn by its magnetic power. It is indeed possible that some of the prayers which speak of the sacrifice were originally offertory-prayers relating to the offered gifts of the people; but it is certainly not this idea of oblation that gave to the sacrificial idea its irresistible force.

It is instructive to compare the *Quam oblationem* with the corresponding forms in Serapion's liturgy. There we read: "To thee have we offered this bread, the likeness of the body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the holy Body, because the Lord Jesus Christ, in the night . . ." (here follow the words of institution, over the bread) "Wherefore we also, making the likeness of the death, have offered the bread, and beseech thee, through this sacrifice be reconciled to all of us, and be merciful, O God of truth." Next follows the prayer about the unity of the church, from the *Didache*, and a corresponding form for the Chalice. The Roman canon prays that God will make the oblation "in every way blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may become to us the body and blood of thy most beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord." An older form of this prayer is preserved in the pseudo-Ambrosian *De sacramentis*: "Make unto us this oblation to be approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, because it is a likeness of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." [1]

Even if it be granted that the words *likeness* or *symbol* in our modern usage mean much less than in the ancient Greek and Latin use of the words, the change which has here been introduced into the form of expression assuredly corresponds to a change in outlook. A more material view of the real presence has displaced a more undefined view; the localising of the presence in the elements has become more pronounced. So also the "symbolic-sacrificial" view of Serapion has been replaced by a more concrete view. The cause is not to be found in any increased emphasis on the offering of material gifts, for at this period the offering of gifts in kind was diminishing in importance. Rather it is to be found in the localising of the eucharistic mystery, in the coalescing of the ideas of the Sacrifice and the Presence, at the central point of the service. This is the Roman conception of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which came to dominate the worship of the mediæval church.

---

[1] "Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem acceptabilem, quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi." Cf. Batiffol, *Études*, II. 361 f.

Our analysis of the Roman rite has led us to find its leading characteristic in the union of the elements of Mystery and Sacrifice. But the union was not absolute or final. In the piety of the later Middle Ages, centring in the Reserved Sacrament, we shall find the element of Mystery recovering something of its independence.

2. Aspects of the Eucharist in the Middle Ages.

Thanksgiving.

We have now to attempt a sketch of the mediæval eucharist, using the same main divisions of the subject which we adopted in our study of the liturgies of the early church. Since, however, the rite has now assumed a fixed form, we shall be occupied less with liturgical material than with the actual practice of the church, and with the efforts of the theologians to formulate and to refine the expressions demanded by popular religion.

We have seen that the element of thanksgiving, which had once found its chief expression in the Anaphora as a whole, had now disappeared from the Canon. And while the Preface and *Sanctus* still remained, and the proper prefaces of the Western church preserved a relic of the charismatic freedom of the primitive church, when the prophets had been allowed to "offer thanksgiving as much as they will,"[1] yet the number of the proper prefaces was greatly cut down, and Roman terseness pruned their exuberance, so that the note of thanksgiving became here also less marked. In isolated cases, such as the Roman preface for Feasts of Apostles, it disappears from the first part of the preface.[1]

---

[1] *Didache*, Chap. X.

Yet the element of thanksgiving regained in large measure in the outlying parts of the service what it had lost at the centre. The chief instance is the addition of *Gloria in excelsis* to the scheme of the mass; first used only at Christmas, in time it won for itself a place also at other festivals, till at last it became a part of the liturgy on festivals and on Sundays except during Advent and the time from Septuagesima to Easter.[2] Then, again, the interlude of singing between the Epistle and Gospel gave room for the note of praise to ring out. It is true that the Gradual, like the Introit, was now cut down to one or two verses; but the *Alleluya*, with which it had been united since the disappearance of the prophetic lesson, swelled out into long musical phrases, in which the commentators on the mass see the church's participation in the gladness of the Saints in heaven. At this point the sequences also were added; and here mediæval hymnody found opportunity for a freer self-expression than was possible in the breviary. Over 4000 sequences are known, and they include some of the noblest creations of sacred poetry. The best known are those for Easter, Whitsun and Corpus Christi; the last of these, the noble *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, by Thomas Aquinas, shows how the note of thanksgiving could find expression even in the idea of sacrifice which had ousted it from the canon, and how the subtleties of transubstantiation could themselves be turned into praise. Again, the Nicene Creed, which was used in the Roman mass at least from the eleventh century, is best regarded from the same point of view. It ranks with the *Te Deum* among the noblest expressions of Christian praise and thanksgiving.

In the later part of the mass there is little room (apart from the Preface and *Sanctus*) for corporate expression of thanksgiving; it must be remembered that the communion of the people was now no longer a regular part of the Sunday mass. At the same time, popular books of devotion often contained beautiful expressions of praise, mostly connected with the elevation of the elements.[3] Perhaps a thorough study of mediæval devotion, with this point in view, would reveal other ways in which the Latin mass of the Middle Ages realised the eucharistic character, and was truly an act of thanksgiving. But it must not be forgotten, on the other hand, that most of the points we have mentioned, at which the note of praise could be heard, apply only to high mass. At the low masses, which in the later Middle Ages engaged the cathedrals and abbey churches, there was no part to be taken by choir, sacred ministers or congregation. In the low tones of the solitary celebrant no song of praise could ring out. Here the element of Thanksgiving was completely ousted by that of Sacrifice.

---

[1] "Vere dignum et iustum est, æquum et salutare, te Dominum suppliciter exorare ut gregem tuam, Pastor æterne, non deseras."

[2] Joseph Braun, S. J., *Liturgisches Handlexikon*, p. 124 f.

[3] The Folk's Mass Book, an English Exposition of the mass, from the thirteenth century, provides an instance:

Communion.

We have seen how the Roman mass suffered a weakening of the note of Fellowship in the loss of the Litany of the Deacon, and the transference of the Kiss of Peace to its later place; probably the loss of the Litany involved the loss of the prayer for the unity of the church, which goes back to the *Didache*. On the whole the developed Roman rite is remarkably deficient in the sense of corporate fellowship; even though, on the other hand, the *Communicantes* of the canon gives a remarkable expression to the thought of fellowship with the saints, and the salutation and the " we-form " of the prayers occur throughout the service. While an isolated collect, such as the secret for Corpus Christi, can express the idea of Christian unity, this instance seems to be not so much the fruit of the church's living consciousness of its unity, as of a theological idea which the learned Thomas Aquinas had read in Augustine.

For the communion of the people was no longer part of the regular Sunday service. The beginnings of the decline of communion can be traced in the early church; in the Carolingian period it was already the common practice that communion was only given at a few masses, and the minimum requirement was that everyone should communicate three times a year. Later on, it was reduced to once a year; and the Easter communion took its place as a sort of general muster of all members of the church who were

---

Praise be thou, King,
And blessed be thou, King,
Of all thy gifts good,
And thanked be thou, King.

Jesu, all my joying,
That for me spilt thy blood,
And died upon the rood,
Thou give me grace to sing
The song of thy praising.

Quoted in Stone, *History of the Holy Eucharist*, I. 356 f.

not under censure. For the individual it was the act whereby he claimed his place in the system of grace, under the condition that he fulfilled the duty which the church imposed on him of tithe and penance.

There was more anxiety to prevent unworthy communion than to exhort to frequent communion. In the liturgy, the communion of the people was regarded as an incidental, or rather as an exceptional, feature of the service. It is typical that the detailed instructions of mediæval synodical statutes regarding the celebration of mass practically never allude to the people's communion. And it was the indifference of the people with regard to communion that made possible the withdrawal of the chalice from the laity. The Hussite movement, which encouraged daily communion, objected at the same time to communion under one kind only. Yet in devout circles, especially in the monasteries, frequent communion was far from unknown, and the reasons for and against it were debated among the scholastics.[1] Thomas à Kempis represents perhaps the sacramental piety of the Middle Ages at its very best; but it is to be noted that while he gives us many beautiful sayings about the union of the individual Christian with the Lord, we find in him scarcely a trace of the thought which was so central to the view of the primitive church, the union of the faithful with one another through communion. It is the Johannine mystery-type which fills the picture, to the complete exclusion of the Pauline.

It is true that, so long as the Sunday mass remained the parish service, the thought of fellowship could never be completely lost. It is true also that something of the element of fellowship lingered in the constant demand throughout the Middle Ages for sermons and for hymns in the vernacular, at least on the great festivals. But as the languages of the nations grew to maturity, the use of a dead language became an insuperable hindrance to the participation of the congregation in the service, as indeed it is still, in spite of all the expositions of the service in popular handbooks. And at the private masses said at side altars, the element of fellowship was as completely lost as that of thanksgiving.

It is above all the neglect of this aspect of the eucharist which makes the mediæval period, in spite of all its external splendour, a time of decline and (in Luther's phrase) of "captivity," in the history of the sacrament.

---

[1] Stone, I. p. 336.

Commemoration.

The historical side of the eucharistic rite, like other aspects of the service, was overshadowed by the offering of the sacrifice in the Latin Church of the Middle Ages.

It is true that the words of institution are more prominent in the Roman mass than in any other; but the fact that they had now become a liturgical formula tended rather to obscure their witness to historical fact. The Anamnesis of the canon contained the summary of the story of redemption, and two other passages of the canon the memory of the saints; but they could at best only awaken the celebrant's own recollection, for the people did not hear them. It was little better with the lections, which were read in a language not understood by the people. A certain effort was made to remedy this fault by the exposition of the Gospel in the vernacular; but the mediæval sermons which we possess often seem more calculated to obscure the historical perspective than to set it forth. But there were two ways in which the mediæval church did succeed to some extent in showing the historical meaning of the liturgy.

The first was the liturgical year. The *de tempore* principle was, as we have seen, perhaps the chief positive contribution of the Western church to the development of the liturgy. In spite of the work of the Roman spirit in pruning the variable element in the Western rite, and in spite of the fact that the meaning of the variable texts was hidden from the multitude by their Latin dress, there remained the connection of the church seasons with the cardinal facts of redemption; and both music and ceremonial helped to give each season its special character. Year by year the sacred ceremonies formed a dramatic spectacle, which reached its climax in the great ritual of Holy Week and Easter. Besides the proper of seasons there was the proper of the saints, wherein the church's memories of antiquity were enriched with memories of the greatest names of the Middle Ages themselves. No doubt much that was believed about the saints was not historically true; but the legendary element was mainly confined to the breviary, for in the mass it had little opportunity to express itself. Then we must not forget the local usages, which in a measure allowed the local history of each diocese to be reflected in its services, and also the multitude of commemorations and anniversaries which belonged to particular churches. The sacrificial offering of the mass—we may perhaps say, in spite of itself—served at this point to strengthen the historical link with past generations.

The second way was provided by the "expositions of the mass," with their allegorical explanations of the various stages in the rite. The typical and the most influential of these expositions was that of Amalarius of Metz, the disciple of Alcuin.[1] The main idea was that the liturgy itself should be used so as to bring to remembrance the passion of Christ; the first part of the mass, however, deals with the history of Christ before his entry into Jerusalem. Some confusion of the order of events is inevitable. While the Introit symbolises generally the coming of Christ and his ministry, the *Gloria* shows the joy in heaven after his Resurrection; and when the Bishop sits down in his throne, there is symbolised the session of Christ at the Father's right hand. The Epistle, Gradual and Gospel, signify the proclaiming of the Old and the New Covenants, and Christ's own preaching. The salutation before the Offertory is the greeting of the crowd at the Triumphal Entry. When the priest offers the oblation, Amalarius sees the entry of Christ into the temple to offer himself to the Father. In the *Sanctus* he is greeted with the people's praise; the first part of the canon recalls the beginning of the Passion, and the disciples' flight. The remainder of the service symbolises the death of the Lord, the centurion's confession, the taking-down of the body, the burial, the resurrection, the appearance at Emmaus, and lastly the Ascension.

Other types of exposition were in vogue, but Amalarius' scheme had the widest influence, and was reproduced in sermons and popular teaching. The interpretation of the different points might, of course, be varied at will, and Old Testament allusions were frequently added. It is particularly to be noticed, how entirely unrelated the exposition is to the text of the liturgy; thus, for instance, no effort whatever is made to present to the layman the substance of the canon. It is the ceremonial which engages the attention of the commentators; thus, in an exposition by Berthold of Ratisbon, every one of the signings with the cross made by the priest during the canon signifies a wound inflicted on Jesus.

In spite of the manifest defects of such an allegorical method, we have here a really interesting attempt to set forth the commemoration-aspect of the mass in a popular way. It cannot be denied that the interpretations which are here so violently forced on the ritual are in themselves thoroughly evangelical. If the symbolical setting-forth of his Passion was one side of our Lord's own action at the Last Supper, this should not be neglected in any form of worship which claims the evangelical name.

---

[1] Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, Part II; and cf. Frere, *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial* (1928 edition), p. 151 ff.

Sacrifice and Mystery.

We have seen in our study of the Roman mass that the old "symbolic-sacrificial" view of the Antiochenes and the Western Fathers is not sufficient to explain the mediæval conception of the sacrifice of the mass. Other forces were at work, the elemental forces of popular religion, while at the same time theological thought was constantly endeavouring to keep the church's doctrine on a level which could be called evangelical.

The mediæval idea of the sacrifice of the mass appears in its characteristic form as early as Gregory the Great. For him the mass is actually a repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary; communion is quite overshadowed in importance by this ever-renewed sacrificial act. Its effect is indeed the forgiveness of sins; but the doctrine of Purgatory shows how that effect can extend to the other side of the grave, and Gregory sees in the mass a powerful aid also in temporal affairs.[1] Here we have the starting-point for the masses for the dead and the votive masses, which make perhaps the ugliest crop of weeds in mediæval church life.

It must indeed be admitted that both the mass for the dead, and in many cases votive masses also, are capable of bearing a high religious value, if the service be regarded as the supreme act of Christian prayer; but there is no doubt that in the common mediæval conception, the ritual act was thought of as having a value of its own. With the specialising of the intention of the mass the danger of a magical view increases. While the Leonine Sacramentary is relatively restrained, the Gelasian provides for some sixty votive masses, including masses for rain and fair weather, for fruitfulness, against unrighteous judges, and against slander. In Gregory and in Bede we find tales of prisoners released because masses were said for them.[2] The most terrible instance is the use of the mass in order to bring about someone's death, which was condemned by a synod at Toledo in 694. But so long as the object of a mass was praiseworthy, the church made no objection, and the specialising of intention continued. There were masses against various sicknesses, in which the aid of some saint was often invoked, as of St. Sebastian against plague, and St. Roch against epidemics; in the tenth century we find masses for the capture of thieves and the recovery of stolen goods; and the visitations of the later Middle Ages led to the same aid being sought against witches, Turks and Hussites.

---

[1] Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, III. p. 41 f.

[2] Franz, pp. 5, 122.

Popular ideas about Hell and Purgatory invested the mass for the dead with a very naïve realism. A mass said on Monday could secure for the tormented souls a prolongation of their Sunday rest. For the damned nothing could be done, except possibly some alleviation of their pain. An approved series of masses such as the Gregorian septenary could be more effective than a single mass; St. Birgitta of Sweden once had a command from an angel to cause thirty priests to say thirty masses for a soul in Purgatory.[1] The cause of this progressive paganising of the holy rite of the Gospel is surely to be found in the welling-up of primitive religious ideas out of the depths of the popular religious consciousness. The sin of the authorities of the church consisted in their passive acquiescence. But when the multiplication of masses became the means of financing the splendid ecclesiastical edifice of the later Middle Ages, the time was ripe for the Reformer's hammer.

When theological thought awoke to life after the Teutonic invasions, the mass was one of the chief issues which needed to be studied and defined. Here tradition offered a choice between Augustinian symbolism and Ambrosian realism; but the development of popular devotion and of ecclesiastical practice had already decided the issue. Any church theology was now bound to start from the "concretised" idea of the eucharistic sacrifice; the problem was to reconcile this with the demands of the intellect, rather than to find a theological expression for the religious experience of communion.[2] There was besides a steady pressure from the gross superstition of the period; the Teutonic peoples wanted an active God, and for them the natural expression of God's activity was miracle.

For all these reasons the tendency to a concrete, localising doctrine was irresistible; and a conception of the sacrifice which had now definitely lost the evangelical character found its basis in a debased idea of the presence. It is true that the scholastic writers constantly refer also to communion, and seek to determine the nature of the food which is there offered to the soul; but the primary question is that of the sacrifice. And the immensely increased emphasis on the awful holiness of the sacred elements must have tended to frighten people away from communion.

---

[1] Franz, p. 266.

[2] Seeberg, III. p. 464 f.

The history of the theological definitions of the doctrine makes it clear how grievous was the yoke of popular devotion and popular ideas. In Paschasius Radbertus the conflict is renewed between symbolism and realism, but the verdict was bound to go in favour of the latter, and the result was the first formulation of transubstantiation. Yet for Radbertus the real presence is still a fact in the world of faith rather than in the physical world, and he tries to save his intellectual conscience by obscure language about *figura* and *veritas*.[1] And in spite of the attempts of Ratramnus to reach a more spiritual view, and the return to Augustinian ideas which we find in Rabanus Maurus, the line of development was now fixed, and transubstantiation received official authority as a result of the controversy in the eleventh century with Berengarius of Tours. Never has it been formulated more crudely than in the confession forced from him at Rome in 1059: "the bread and wine . . . after consecration, are the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, not merely the sacrament thereof; and that body is sensibly, not merely sacramentally, but in reality (*sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate*), handled by the priest's hands and crushed by the teeth of the faithful."[2] This is to meet rationalism not with sacramentalism, but with religious materialism.

Yet the better kind of theological thought never gave up the attempt to recover a more spiritual view. After Augustine's example, the distinction was made between the visible elements and the super-sensible sacramental gift, *res sacramenti*; and in the "impanation theory" attempts were made to find a middle way between symbolism and realism: the bread is not transubstantiated, its substance remains, but the personal presence of Christ is added to it as a heavenly substance. This view was a desperate attempt, in face of great difficulties, to preserve something like a spiritual interpretation; it was to be revived by Scotus and Ockham, and passed on by them to Luther.[3]

---

[1] Seeberg, III. 70 ff. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 471 f.

[2] Seeberg, III. 198; Stone, I. 247.

[3] Seeberg, III. p. 203.

The realistic view definitely triumphed in the acceptance of transubstantiation by the Lateran Council of 1215; it was the authorisation of a formula which had long been in use, and of the scholastic terminology of substance and accident. Yet the definition left wide scope for variety of interpretation. For a long time it had been held that the body of Christ was present not only in every host, but in every particle of every host. And when the later scholastics, Bonaventura, Thomas, or Scotus, seek to state this thought with precision, and to relate it to the doctrine of transubstantiation, by some hair-splitting analysis of the quantitative, dimensional, or substantial presence of the body of Christ, what is this but an unconscious effort to blunt the edge of a formula which had been forced on theology by the materialism of popular piety? What sort of corporeity belongs to a body which lacks size and dimensions, and is "substantially" present at every conceivable mathematical point in another body? Nor did the official definition wholly exclude even the real persistence of the substance of the bread; where all things were possible, two substances might exist in one thing. This opened the way for the later Nominalism of Peter d'Ailly and Ockham to go back in effect to the theory of impanation.

But though transubstantiation could not wholly put theological speculation in fetters, it had nevertheless a disastrous influence on the life of the church. The essential points may be summed up as three:

(1) It gave official sanction to the carnalism of the worser sort of popular religion;

(2) by making the localised presence in the elements the centre of the theology of the eucharist, it tied down future thought and controversy to a wrong statement of the problem;

(3) it encouraged the worship of the Host as the abode of the Divine presence, even outside the service.

The last of these points needs further consideration. The cult of the reserved sacrament in the later Middle Ages shows that Sacrifice and Mystery, which in the earlier period had been closely united, were now drawing apart again. This can be seen in the distinction which Thomas Aquinas draws between the sacrament as *sacrificium* and as *communio*. The former of these aspects of the mass shows us man making an offering to God; the second shows us Christ coming to meet man. In the thought and practice of an earlier age, this second aspect was summed up in the act of communion; but Thomas and the later scholastics drew from the doctrine of transubstantiation the corollary that the body and blood of Christ are present beneath the outward form of the elements, so long as they are not annihilated or subjected to any essential change, as, for instance, through digestion; hence the presence must be regarded as continuing in the sacred elements, and they are to be adored by the faithful, both *ante* and *post usum.* Here the localising of the mystery has reached its ultimate point.

Communion from the reserved sacrament was, of course, known in the early church from the time of Justin Martyr; we know also how the sacrament was sometimes reserved in private houses, and there is no doubt that it was regularly used for the communion of the sick. In the early Middle Ages the idea developed of a magic power present both in the Host and in things which came in contact with it; thus the corporal was a potent defence against fire, and one was kept in Cluniac churches for this purpose.[1] But it was not till the new doctrine had gained authoritative sanction that these ideas reached their full development. The later Middle Ages have many naïve legends about the magic power of God's Body, to which sometimes irrational animals paid reverence when men dishonoured it. Very significant is the introduction of the festival of Corpus Christi, for which Thomas himself composed the ritual in 1264, of the elevation of the Host, and of the new devotions before the reserved sacrament.

More important, however, than even the outward ceremonial by which the *Sanctissimum* was and is honoured, is the deep mystical devotion nourished by the thought of the continual Divine presence on the altar. In the Middle Ages this devotion was mainly confined to nunneries, where a mystical piety flourished, with somewhat scanty encouragement from the church; but in modern times the cult of the reserved sacrament has become perhaps the most characteristic devotional form of Roman Catholicism; the assurance of the continual presence there has largely taken the place once filled by the drama of the liturgy.[2] Recently this form of eucharistic mysticism has shown itself capable of spreading outside the bounds of the Roman church; and the continual objective presence in the sanctuary has enticed many a convert to join that church.

---

[1] Franz, p. 89.

[2] Heiler, *Das Gebet*, 5th ed., p. 325; *Der Katholizismus*, p. 534. Casel, in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, II. p. 176.

But even those who are compelled to recognise in this form of piety the self-devotion of deep religion cannot help feeling doubtful whether it is really Christian. For we are here dealing with one aspect of the Christian mystery, specialised to its utmost limit, and isolated from all the complementary aspects. If the Protestant condemnation of the cult of the reserved sacrament as idolatrous is often grossly unfair, at least to the higher forms of the cult, there is with popular religion an evident danger of a reversion to primitive fetishism. Of this danger the mediæval legends provide some striking illustrations.

A century before the Reformation, Wyclif protested against the worship of the host: " they are worse than heathens, believing that the consecrated host is their god," he says in the *De eucharistia*.[1] He goes back to the symbolism of Augustine, and definitely repudiates the mediæval doctrine in its scholastic formulation, even though he uses for his polemic the weapons of scholastic dialectic. But it would require a special investigation to determine just how far the piety of the later Middle Ages was influenced by transubstantiation. The suggestion may be put forward for discussion, that the loosening of the bond between Sacrifice and Mystery served in some measure to allow the idea of the sacrifice greater freedom, and leave it room to seek a higher expression. This thesis might be supported by a study of Gabriel Biel,[2] in whose writings the aspect of Commemoration comes again into view; the eucharist is called a sacrifice " because it was instituted to be a memorial of the supreme sacrifice offered on the cross "; he will have no identification of the mass with the sacrifice of Calvary, which is not renewed at the altar, but brought to mind. Further, it would be possible to point to the evangelical character of the expositions of the mass, which we noted above; and chiefly and above all to Thomas à Kempis.

The fourth book of the *De Imitatione Christi*, the highest expression of the eucharistic piety of the Middle Ages, came to birth in an environment favourable to a spiritual view of the Divine presence, if we may judge from what we know of à Kempis' contemporary John Wessel.[3] The *De Imitatione* has no words great enough to glorify the eucharistic presence, yet it is wholly free from materialistic thoughts. Though à Kempis has in mind chiefly the devotion of the celebrant himself, yet he has nothing to say about the inherent objective power of the sacrifice; it is the meeting

[1] Seeberg, p. 666. [2] Stone, I. 390. [3] *Ib.*, I. 372.

of the Christian with his God in communion that occupies him. This thought releases the note of thanksgiving. If King David danced before the Ark of the Lord, "if so great devotion was then used, and such celebrating of the Divine praise was kept up before the Ark of the testament; what reverence and devotion ought now to be maintained by me and all Christian people in the presence of the sacrament, in receiving the most precious body of Christ!" [1] In the mass the Christian himself is offered as a sacrifice; a sacrifice called forth by the voice of the Beloved, who reminds him of his own sacrifice: "in like manner oughtest thou also to offer thyself willingly unto me every day in the mass, as a pure and holy oblation, unto the utmost strength of thy soul." The disciple answers: "Thine, O Lord, are all things that are in heaven, and that are in earth. I desire to offer myself up unto thee as a free-will oblation, and to continue thine for ever. . . . Receive thou me, with this holy oblation of the precious body, which I offer unto thee this day in the presence of angels invisibly attending; and may this further the salvation of myself and of all thy people." [2]

Here then we meet again the Augustinian view of the eucharistic sacrifice, but with a characteristic narrowing. The self-oblation of the church to share in Christ's sacrifice has now become the individual's oblation of his own soul. The mediæval mystic has wholly missed the thought of Communion-fellowship; communion regularly means for à Kempis just the meeting of the individual Christian with his heavenly Lord and Friend.

We have repeatedly insisted that the element of Communion-fellowship is altogether indispensable to a balanced evangelical view of the eucharist. But the fellowship of the Christian church never excludes the union of the individual soul with her Lord; and this side of Christian experience has scarcely ever found deeper expression than in some parts of the fourth book of the *De Imitatione*. Yet for the evangelical reader there is a certain aloofness in the monastic atmosphere. A Kempis after all wrote for those whose whole life could be spent in conscious preparation for communion.

---

[1] *De Imitatione Christi*, IV. chap. i.

[2] *Ib.*, chaps. viii, ix.

Penance and Morals.

One more side of the eucharistic practice of the Middle Ages remains to be considered. The means whereby the holy mysteries were protected from misuse and profanation include the fast before communion, and the elaborate rules made to prevent irreverence towards the sacred elements, such as are still to be found in the Roman missal under the title *De defectibus circa missam occurrentibus*; and, more important than either of these, the pains which were taken about moral fitness. We have seen[1] how in the early church the idea of the forgiveness of sins came to be connected with the mass in two ways: first, through the penitential system, which existed to remove the guilt of mortal sin, and thereby made clear the essential pre-condition for receiving communion; and second, through the thought that cleansing from sin in general is part of the gift bestowed in the sacrament. The mediæval development followed this double line.

With regard to the former point, an important difference came in with the growth of private penance, and the limitation of public penance to public and scandalous sins, such as deserved excommunication. At the same time, the idea of mortal sin itself was greatly widened, as a result of the influence of the teaching of Augustine in deepening the sense of sin, and laying the emphasis on the motive more than on the sinful act. On the positive side, the sense of sin was further deepened by the fact that penance was the preparation for receiving the holiest of all mysteries. Various influences, notably that of monastic practice, contributed to draw lighter sins also within the sphere of penance. Yet the main purpose of the system of penance still continued to be the securing of freedom from grievous sins as the essential condition of receiving communion.

This led to the general rule of yearly penance, before the Easter communion, which was sanctioned by the Fourth Lateran Council. The scrupulous attitude of mind, which was especially fostered in the monasteries, demanded doubtless a more thorough spiritual preparation for a good communion, and a more frequent use of the sacrament of penance;[2] but the scholastic explanations of the rule of the Lateran Council maintain that those who were not conscious of having committed mortal sin were not obliged to do more than report the fact to their confessor once a year—usually it was done before Easter. Catherine of Genoa, one of the most interesting saints of the Middle Ages, was for many years a daily communicant without making more than this regular formal report.[1]

---

[1] P. 66 f. above.

[2] *De Imitatione*, IV. 12.

The second point was the expression of the thought of the forgiveness of sins also in the liturgy; and here the strong emphasis which the Roman church from the beginning laid on moral duty can be seen in the liturgy itself. In the original Roman rite the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* in the canon develops the idea of forgiveness of sins in a way which seems alien to the mind of the primitive church, although the forgiveness of sins is mentioned commonly in the Eastern Epiclesis. In the later forms of the Roman mass this emphasis is much strengthened; witness the confession which forms part of the priest's preparation at the altar, the offertory prayers and the Lavabo-psalm, the *Agnus Dei*,[2] and some of the prayers to be said by the priest before and after his communion. Again, the mediæval mass in Germany included a general confession and absolution (" die offene Schuld ") recited in the vernacular after the Sermon.[3] This custom seems to have been in use in the ninth century; but since the extant formulæ date only from the twelfth century, we can hardly endorse Seeberg's dictum that " these ordinances arose at a time when confession to God alone was regarded as sufficient," so that the " offene Schuld " would be an alternative to private confession before a priest. Since this usage attained its full development at a time when private confession was the regular practice, it must have been regarded as complementary to it; hence it is rather to be taken as a sign that formal freedom from mortal sin was no longer regarded as sufficient, and as an example of the way in which the effort to safeguard the holiness of the mysteries by the penitential system introduced the thought of penance and forgiveness into the mass itself; for the use of the general confession was limited to days on which there were to be communicants.

It might seem paradoxical that at the very time when the mass was being surrounded by safeguards intended to ensure that at least the communicants at their approach to the altar should be free from mortal sin, the mass itself and the act of communion should come more and more to be thought of as conveying forgiveness. Yet the idea is very intelligible, both historically, in view of the one sacrifice offered for the forgiveness of sins, and the occurrence of the same thought in the words of institution, and psychologically, because nothing can so effectually awaken and increase the sense of sin as the near presence of that which is holy. This applies even to the non-communicant; the offering of the sacrifice was set forth as the renewing of the Passion of Christ, and it is natural that in the usual type of mediæval explanation of the benefits of hearing mass, the abatement of sin is generally mentioned as one of the chief. But it applies far more fully to the act of communion itself; mortal sin having been purged away before in the sacrament of penance, a chief fruit of communion was the cleansing of lesser sins (*culpa venialis*), and thereby the counteracting of the disposition to commit mortal sins.

---

[1] von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, I. 117–23.

[2] Introduced by Pope Sergius I (687–701)—Fortescue, p. 387.

[3] Seeberg, III. 89. Rietschel, *Liturgik*, I. 368–71.

We may note at this point also the dominance of the Johannine idea of Mystery, as opposed to the Synoptic. In the great scholastics, communion is treated not as the appropriation of the sacrifice of the cross, but rather as the cleansing and strengthening of the soul, through the infusion of the state (*habitus*) of charity into the soul.[1] It is spiritual food, life-giving power, which the mediæval communicant especially finds in the sacrament;[2] and even when the forgiveness of sin is particularly under consideration, the gift of the Divine mercy is regarded chiefly as a bestowal of power.

Perhaps the close connection which the Middle Ages made between penance and communion, and the strong emphasis on moral fitness for communion, form the most important positive contribution of the period to eucharistic thought and practice. An essential element in the evangelical idea of the sacrament was here developed, an element which the early church had by comparison neglected; and it remained as a valuable and important bequest to the generations that followed. At the same time the connection of the evangelical rite with a system of penance and church discipline was bound to involve it in the danger of falling under the bondage of legalism.

---

[1] Seeberg, III. 471.

[2] von Hügel, I. 115; cf. II. 87–88.

CHAPTER IV

THE LUTHERAN TRADITION

1. Luther's Eucharistic Teaching.

In every great awakening or revival the new spirit struggles to burst asunder the old forms, and then, in shaping for itself new forms of self-expression, makes use of the fragments of the system which it has cast away. Nowhere is this principle more evident than in liturgical history. Just as the early church made its forms of service largely out of Jewish materials, so the churches of the Reformation generally, and above all the Lutheran churches, worked with liturgical material taken from Latin Catholicism.

Modern Protestant scholars, with few exceptions, show a partisan zeal for the new principles, taking as a standard by which to judge the movement, its power to remould completely the external forms of religion. This criterion has not told at all in favour of Lutheranism, which is of all religious movements the most contradictory. Above all, in the eucharistic doctrine and practice of Lutheranism we have been asked to see a supreme example of the power of the old forms to bind even Luther's strong spirit in chains, and a stock instance of "The Catholic elements retained by Luther along with and in his Christianity"—to quote a chapter-heading from Harnack's *History of Dogma*.[1] It is taken for granted that the word "Catholic" is a term of reproach. Yet are not the ancient Catholic forms vehicles of genuine religious experience, on whose adequacy we are not competent to pronounce a final judgment? Perhaps it will turn out that the very contradictions of Lutheranism correspond to an actual balance of opposites in the essential nature of Christian worship.

It is not necessary to add another to the existing histories of Luther's teaching; but a study of the Lutheran forms of service will hardly be intelligible without a sketch of the governing ideas which the forms were intended to express. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the underlying ideas will often find a more truthful expression in the liturgical forms than in speculative or controversial treatises.

---

[1] Vol. VII. p. 230.

Luther's Early Writings.[1]

No one will understand aright Luther's view of the eucharist who cannot appreciate intuitively the impressions which monastic life had made upon him. When he criticised the subtleties of the earlier scholastics, it was Nominalism that furnished him with both tools and methods. In his later utterances he condemned the ascetical exercises whereby he had tempted God in his youth; but it is incredible that those exercises had not left other and deeper marks on his soul. In truth the Augustinian brother's devotion to the mass had a positive value and left an impression which the reformer never lost. The famous story, that at his first mass he nearly ran away from the altar for very fear of approaching the presence of the living God, has indeed been doubted as regards its details; [2] but it is certainly based on a real experience, an ineffaceable impression of the mystery and the awfulness of the Divine presence. Is it over-bold to assert that throughout his life he retained a deep religious impression from the old Latin service, which his controversial writings indeed might seem to belie, but which never allowed him to lose hold of the element of Mystery in the eucharist, nor to break altogether with the traditional forms of the church's worship?

Luther's earliest writings about the eucharist are specially important for the understanding of the positive basis of his teaching, all the more because they are mainly homiletic and non-controversial. In his sermon *De digna præparatione cordis pro suscipiendo sacramento eucharistiæ*,[3] dating from the spring of 1518, he emphasises the guiltiness of the sin of discord, because the sacrament is in its nature *communio*, an act of fellowship; and the same thought is expressed, but with much greater vigour and clearness, in *Ein Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den Bruderschaften* (1519).[4] Seeberg well remarks that Luther never in any of his eucharistic writings came so near to the spirit of the primitive church.[5] Equally also the Augustinian note is evident. I am persuaded that the best starting-point for a study of Luther's teaching is to be found here, and not in the controversial writings which began in 1520.

---

[1] For the following account of Luther's teaching see: Köstlin, *Die Theologie Luthers*, I, II. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, IV. 1, § 85, 88. Jacoby, *Die Liturgik der Reformatoren*, I–II. Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, Vols. I, II, III.

[2] Scheel, *Martin Luther*, II. 47 ff.

[3] Köstlin, I. 248 f.

[4] Köstlin, I. 256–62.

[5] IV. i. p. 325.

Except for an incidental reference or two, the criticism of abuses is conspicuous by its absence. Starting, as in the earlier sermon, from the Augustinian distinction between *signum* and *res*, he takes the meaning of communion as above all incorporation into the fellowship of the saints; "therefore it is commonly called *Synaxis* or *Communio*, that is, fellowship; and the Latin *communicare* means to receive this fellowship, where we speak in German of 'going to the sacrament'; and the point is this: That Christ with all his saints is one spiritual body, just as the people in a city are a community and a body, and every citizen is related as a member to his neighbour and to the city. So are all saints members in Christ and in the church, which is a spiritual, eternal City of God; and when one is received into this City, he is said to be received into the fellowship of the saints, and incorporated into, made a member of, Christ's spiritual Body. . . . Thus to receive this sacrament in bread and wine is naught else than to receive a sign of this fellowship and incorporation with Christ and all his saints."[1] And as the citizen, who is received into the fellowship of the city, shares in its freedom and its privileges, and enjoys its protection, so the Christian receives power and help from the spiritual fellowship, into which he is incorporated through the sacrament; "suffering and sin are shared in common, and so love is kindled from love. In the sacrament God gives us help against sin, as though he were to say: See, thou art troubled by manifold sins; receive then this sign, whereby I assure thee that thy sin troubles not thee alone, but also my Son Christ and all his saints in heaven and on earth. Therefore be comforted, and be of good courage; thou fightest not alone; strong help and succour are around thee."[2] Here the imputed righteousness is not based on any forensic act, but on a deep inward fellowship, such as the *De libertate Christiana* describes in the language of bridal mysticism: "all my sin is his, all his glory is mine." But here the thought of sacramental fellowship embraces not only the individual soul and her Bridegroom, but the whole company of the citizens of God's eternal City.

As a symbol for the intimacy of this union, the old picture from the *Didache* comes back again, in a peculiarly developed form: "As the bread is kneaded together out of many little grains, and the bodies of the many grains go into the body of the one bread, and each single grain loses its body and its form, and shares in the common body of the bread, and similarly also the little grapes, losing their separate form, unite to make the common body of the wine—so should it be, and so it is, with us, when we rightly use this sacrament; Christ with all saints takes our form, through his great love, and fights with us against sin, death, and all evil. By this we too are enkindled in love to take his form, to trust in his righteousness, life, and salvation; and so, through fellowship between his blessedness and our woe, to become one cake, one bread, one body, one cup, and all is shared in common." [1] The fellowship of communion pledges us to share in the service of one another, and it makes us partakers of the sufferings of Christ, and of all his saints.

---

[1] Luther's Works, Weimar Edition, II. 743.

[2] II. 744.

Here the typical Pauline and Augustinian view has returned The idea of communion-fellowship was indeed in the air at this time—it was part of the humanism of Colet and Erasmus [2]—Luther's contribution was to bring out the *mystery* of sacramental fellowship, which has indeed rarely found nobler expression than in his *Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament.* The rediscovery of the idea of communion is the greatest positive contribution of the Reformation in regard to the eucharist; it is of more value than all the criticisms of the mass. Communion-fellowship, which Thomas Aquinas had dimly seen to be part of the great heritage of Augustine, now became a living element of religious experience, and a chief factor in the remodelling of worship. But it was Luther's merit to unite with it his strong hold on the element of Mystery. In this sermon he shows at least as strong a grasp of Mystery as later when he maintained the real presence in his controversy with Zwingli and Œcolampadius. He does not yet deny the miracle of transubstantiation, and he can even find in it matter for edification, as when he interprets the change of the substances of the bread and wine as symbolical of our union with the spiritual body of Christ. But he has already learnt that " this food seeks only a hungry soul, and flies nothing so much as a full, satisfied soul which has no need of it." He does not doubt the objective character of the Divine presence, but he has learnt that its reality is experienced only by faith: the tormented soul, which with faith and with desire receives communion or hears mass, experiences " how Christ with his saints comes to thee with all his merits, his passion and his grace, that with thee he may live, act, suffer, endure, and die, willing to be altogether thine, and share all with thee."

---

[1] II. 748.

[2] Stone, *History of the Holy Eucharist*, II. pp. 3 ff., 62.

But in spite of the central importance of the rediscovery of communion-fellowship in the Lutheran Reformation, it was soon to be thrown into the background by the exigencies of controversy.

Luther's Anti-Roman Writings.

From 1520 onwards all Luther's eucharistic teaching is controversial. The battle-front changes; first he is fighting against the Roman misuse of the mass, particularly in the doctrine of the sacrifice, then against the rationalism of Zwingli, which explained away the element of Mystery. It is rash, however, to assume that in either series of writings Luther expressed his whole mind, or that his change of front proves a change in his belief. Certainly he never gave up the thought of communion-fellowship, even if it gradually dropped into a place of secondary importance.

The first writing of the anti-Roman controversy is the *Sermon von dem neuen Testament, d. i. von der heiligen Messe* (1520). A little earlier, in the *Sermon von den guten Werken*, he had found the idea which was to be his chief weapon. Taking the word *Testamentum* in its literal meaning, he says that Christ instituted "a memorial-celebration or anniversary, to be celebrated daily throughout Christendom, and attached to it a glorious, rich, great testament, which he also determined and ratified, not of revenues, gold, or worldly goods, but of forgiveness for all sins, grace and mercy unto eternal life, that all they who attend this celebration might receive this testament; and by his death he has made the testament permanent and irrevocable. As a sign and deed thereof, he has left us, in place of a document and seal, his own body and blood under the forms of bread and wine." [1]

The first part of the *Sermon von dem neuen Testament* simply develops this idea. The New "testament," foreshadowed in the promises of the Old, is given us in the words of institution; and just as in an earthly testament "a man does not only express his meaning in words, but adds thereto a seal or lawyer's token, that it may be permanent and authentic for all time, so has Christ done with his testament, attaching to it the strongest and noblest of signs and seals in his word, that is, his own true body and blood under bread and wine." [2]

---

[1] Luther's Works, VI. 230.

[2] VI. 259.

Therefore the word of Christ is all-important, and all else in the mass is as much an accessory thereto as the monstrance or corporal is to the Host. Therefore also it was a peculiarly cunning stroke of the devil when he managed to get the words of institution concealed through the silent recitation of the Canon. Here we have the origin of the demand for mass in the vernacular.

Then follows a strong attack on the sacrifice of the mass; no room is indeed left for it when communion is received just as a sign of Christ's testament. Luther sees the origin of the idea of eucharistic sacrifice in the primitive offering of thanksgiving, and also in the collection for the poor; in this connection he makes some interesting remarks on the offertory, and the elevation of the paten with the unconsecrated bread, as symbolising the oblation of gifts to God. Characteristically enough, he gives also an evangelical interpretation of the elevation of the Host: " he elevates it not before God, but before us, to remind us of the Testament and quicken our faith therein." [1] But when we ask what is left of the mass, regarded as a sacrifice, his answer is: " I say that nothing is left."

Yet he does not cast aside the idea of sacrifice. We have nothing to give to God in the sacrament; but there remains the spiritual oblation. " What then shall we offer? Ourselves, all that we have, with constant prayer; as we say, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Herewith we are to dedicate ourselves to the Divine will, that he may do with us as he wills, according to his Divine pleasure. So too we are to offer him our thanks and praise for his unspeakably sweet grace and mercy, which he has promised and given to us in this sacrament. For though this belongs not essentially and necessarily to the mass, as we have said, yet it is more precious, fitting, availing and acceptable when it is done with the multitude and in the congregation, in which case one person awakens, moves and enkindles another, so that it comes with power before God." [2]

The image of the High-priest from the Epistle to the Hebrews leads Luther's thought one step further. We do not offer Christ, but we enter into Christ's oblation—" and in this sense it is permissible and right to call the mass a sacrifice, not indeed in itself, but as the means whereby we offer up ourselves together with Christ; that is to say, that we cast ourselves upon Christ with a sure faith in his testament, to come before God with our prayer, our praise, and our oblation, only through him and his mediation, believing firmly that he is our Shepherd and our Priest (*unser pfarrer oder pfaff*) in heaven before the face of God."

---

[1] VI. 366.

[2] VI. 368.

Thus even with Luther the idea of sacrifice cannot be dismissed; and with him it can only find expression on the high religious level of the Augustinian doctrine of the self-oblation of the individual in the church; while the Epistle to the Hebrews helps him to do justice to the priestly side. We have here an aspect of Luther's sacramental teaching that must not be forgotten, even if controversy prevented it from being developed.[1]

Of the fundamental documents of 1520,[2] neither the *Address to the Christian Nobility* nor the *De Libertate Christiana* refers directly to our present subject; but in the *De Captivitate Babylonica* the eucharistic controversy reaches its climax. Luther is now out for battle; and in the militant atmosphere of this treatise it is a foregone conclusion that the deeper sacramental teaching of the *Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament* will have disappeared.

His treatment of the sacrament begins with a simplification of the problem; he declares that in John vi. " not one syllable refers to the sacrament, not only because the sacrament was not yet instituted, but still more because the order of the exposition makes it clear that Christ is speaking of faith in the Incarnate Word."[3] Modern exegesis, however, is fairly unanimous that this chapter is full of the thought of the sacrament from end to end, and was written to set forth the meaning of the church's holy rite. If Luther's interpretation is intelligible enough from his point of view, there is no need for us to emphasise again here that an evangelical doctrine of the eucharist cannot rightly be founded on an arbitrary mutilation of the Gospel basis. Luther, however, in spite of all the emphasis which he laid on Mystery in his later writings, and the Johannine thoughts which he was consequently led to reproduce, never went back on his interpretation of the discourse on the Bread of Life.

The " first captivity " of the sacrament is the denial of the chalice to the laity; but this point is chiefly valuable to the writer as a controversial weapon. The second is the doctrine of transubstantiation, which he now formally repudiates. He can go back to the Nominalist attempt to maintain the permanence of the substance of the bread; and he quotes Peter d'Ailly to the effect that if the church had not decided otherwise it would be more natural to think that the substances of bread and wine still remain on the altar. Thus it was that the old theory of impanation or consubstantiation came to be the Lutheran doctrine. His criticism was not based on philosophical grounds, but on what seemed to him to be the clear witness of Scripture; and never for a moment does he cast doubt on the real presence. His carefulness to guard the element of Mystery is seen in the oft-repeated analogy of iron and fire, whose two substances are united in the glowing iron, and clearer still in his comparison of the sacrament with the Incarnation; the parallel with the doctrine of the Two Natures requires that the substance of the bread be not annihilated: "It is with the sacrament as with Christ himself. As for the bodily indwelling of the Godhead, it was not necessary that the human nature should be transubstantiated, so that the Divinity should be present under the accidents of the human nature; but each nature remains whole and inviolate; this man is God, this God is man."[1] It is specially important to note this point: that even in a treatise where his own exposition of the nature of the sacrament would seem to leave no room at all for a doctrine of the presence, he is yet treating the sacrament as a symbol of the Incarnation.

---

[1] Jacoby, I. 205.

[2] English translation in Wace and Buchheim, *Luther's Primary Works* (London, 1896).

[3] Luther's Works, VI. 502.

The "third captivity" is the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and here his main attack is delivered. As in the *Sermon von dem neuen Testament,* his chief weapon is the testament-idea. "A testament is a promise made by a man before death, whereby he assigns his inheritance and appoints his heirs."[2] Here the gift is the forgiveness of sins. On man's side is required faith in the word of the promise. But on this "shall follow the sweetest music in the heart, whereby the spirit is enlarged and fructified (this is the gift of love, bestowed by the Holy Spirit through faith in Christ), so that the Christian is led to Christ, the gracious and noble Testator, and becomes altogether a new man."[3]

So the gift of love, which according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and also Luther's own earlier doctrine, is a fruit of communion, comes to be treated wholly as the result of thankfulness. This is a depreciation of the meaning of the eucharist, which may be compared with the small place occupied in this treatise by communion-fellowship. The strongest side of the testament-idea is the central place which it assigns to God's gift; but for this reason also there is less room here than in his earlier writings for any idea of oblation. Only the prayers which accompany the mass can be regarded as offered to God. Luther can find no thought of oblation in the first of all masses: "When Christ instituted this sacrament and set forth his testament at the Last Supper, he did not offer it as a sacrifice to God the Father, nor perform the act as a sacrifice for others, but sitting at the table he set forth his testament for one and all, and gave them a sign thereof."[1]

---

[1] VI. 511. [2] VI. 513. [3] VI. 515.

It is hard to escape from the impression that it is precisely its applicability to the Last Supper that shows the inadequacy of the testament-idea. The consequence should be a strong emphasis on the "memorial-aspect" of the mass; on the other hand, it becomes immediately evident that the legal metaphor is quite unfit to express the meaning of the sacrificial death of Christ. Again, there is no natural connection with the act of communion. Luther maintains, of course, that communion is essential to the mass; but while in the *Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament* it takes its natural place in a scheme of thought, it has no clear relation to the idea of the testament. Would not the gift of the testament be equally valid without a physical appropriation of its sign and seal? This consideration amounts in fact to a *reductio ad absurdum* of the idea.

It is further typical of Luther, that while he here enunciates the most radical liturgical principle which he ever uttered: "the closer any mass approaches to the first of all masses, which Christ celebrated at the supper, the more Christian it is," he refuses to draw the practical consequences. In truth the Church's traditional manner of celebrating the service has a value which Luther would have been the first to miss.

Seeberg is without doubt right in claiming that the emphasis on the forgiveness of sins in this doctrine of the sacrament tended to rob the communion of its proper meaning, and practically to make it a doublet of the Penance which normally preceded it. It is for the student of Luther's dogmatic theology to show how he came to use the term "forgiveness of sins" as the one comprehensive phrase for God's justifying and sanctifying work, wherein he imparts himself to men: this was only possible because the term was used by him to convey a positive meaning, such as it does not normally bear. It was inevitable, however, that when the term recovered its normal, restricted meaning, the treasures which Luther entrusted to its keeping should be lost; the fatal results are only too evident to-day. In Lutheran preaching the idea of the forgiveness of sins has too often been treated as separate from the gift of "life and blessedness" which Luther always connected closely with it; as, for instance, in the *Lesser Catechism*.

---

[1] VI. 523.

For the time, however, the testament-idea had its value. Besides its controversial utility, a strong reaction in the name of personal religion was needed to break the fetters of a materialised and unethical worship; the pity was, that both here and with the doctrine of justification, legal analogies had to be employed. It was also useful for instruction; it underlies the sacramental teaching of the two Catechisms, which are dominated by the thought of the individual appropriation of the forgiveness of sins as the fruit of communion. But it was not adequate to express Luther's religious conception of the sacrament.

Luther's Anti-Zwinglian Writings.

The necessity of dealing with the "spiritualisers" in his own camp, and later with the Swiss Reformers, drove Luther to reflect on the element of Mystery in the eucharist. But, unfortunately, once again it was in controversy that his deeper sacramental teaching took shape.

The Dutchman Hoen was the first to propound, in a letter to Luther in 1521, a purely symbolistic interpretation of the words of institution: *est* means *significat*. In plain fact this was little more than a logical application of the testament-idea. But to Luther's mind it was a perversion of the evident meaning of the words, as appears in the *Vom Anbeten des Sakraments des heil. Leichnams Christi* (1523), a treatise chiefly directed against the Bohemian Brethren, whose refusal to allow the adoration of the sacrament awakened his suspicions.[1] While he still lays the chief emphasis on faith in the word of promise, he adumbrates the attitude which was to become clear in his anti-Zwinglian writings.

Probably it was his experiences in the spring of 1522 that first warned him of what was to come. In the *Invocavit*-sermons, delivered after his return from Wartburg, he was contending against a spirit which he felt to be alien to his own; in Carlstadt's indiscriminate communion-services he scented the danger of the profanation of the sacrament. In any case, it is Carlstadt's teaching which he first attacks in his violent *Wider die himmlischen Propheten von Bildern und Sakrament.*[1] Here again he starts with the exegesis of the words of institution; Carlstadt had put out a theory of his own which was comparatively easy to refute. But the way in which the "spiritualising" teaching was being put into practice was making him very suspicious of all efforts to explain away God's outward ordinances; and his problem now was to relate the doctrine of the testament with the real presence of the body and blood of Christ. The Passion, after all, lay behind both; and the reception of the true body and blood of Christ was the guarantee of the validity of the testament. But this was hardly more than an artificial and formal reconciliation of two radically different ideas; the real meaning of the difficulty is that the controversial battle-front has changed, and the real presence is now occupying his thoughts. Now he formulates his theory of the *synecdoche*: when Christ says, "This is my body," it is an example of the rhetorical figure of *synecdoche*, where the name of the whole stands for the part. Now also Carlstadt's denials of the possibility of repeated descents of Christ into the sacrament drive him to speculate about the mystery of the Divine being.[2]

---

[1] Köstlin, I. 395 f., 415 ff.

Soon Zwingli entered the arena, with the *Letter to Alber*, 1524, *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*, 1525, and *Unterrichtung von Nachtmahl Christi*, 1526. We are not concerned here to trace the historical development of the dispute;[3] our endeavour is to discern in Luther's polemical writings the religious motives which constituted for him the supreme issue. Luther saw in Zwingli a fresh outburst of "fanaticism" of Carlstadt's type, and he replied to him in a series of sermons, collected in the autumn of 1526 under the title *Sermon von dem Sakrament des Leibes und Blutes Christi, wider die Schwarmgeister*, and in his preface to the *Syngramma Suevicum*. Here we meet a new line of thought: God is everywhere, in all created things, in stone and in fire, in water and in a rope; but he wills not that we seek him there, but only where his word is.[4] This is the doctrine of Ubiquity, which was to become the corner-stone of Luther's eucharistic teaching.

---

[1] XVIII. 37–214.

[2] Seeberg, IV. i. p. 329; Köstlin, I. 424. "Summa: the mad spirit (Carlstadt) has childish ideas, as if Christ went up and came down. He does not understand the kingdom of Christ, which is everywhere, and, as Paul says, fills all things." Luther's Works, XVIII. p. 206.

[3] See especially the great work of Professor W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther, ihr Streit über das Abendmahl*, I. (1924).

[4] "For though he is everywhere, and I might find him in stone, in fire, in water, even in a rope, for certainly he is present in all these, yet he wills

It appears fully developed in *Dass diese Worte Christi "Das ist mein Leib" noch fest stehen, wider die Schwarmgeister* (1527)—a work which, in spite of much that may seem strange to us in its argument and form of expression, is yet one of those which show the supreme power of Luther's grasp on the realities of religion. With biting satire he exposes the limitations in his adversaries' conception. Their problem is, how Christ's body can be at once at God's right hand and on the altar; but "Scripture teaches that God's right hand is not a place in which a body might be situated, as on a golden throne, but is God's almighty power, which at once cannot be in any place, and yet must be in every place." [1]

The idea of God as dwelling in a local heaven, which Luther so energetically tears in pieces, was derived from the scholastic statements of the problem. The doctrine of immanence which he develops is related to mediæval German mysticism,[2] and it reflects his intensely Christocentric view of revelation. God is wholly present only in Christ, God's incarnate Son is personally God; therefore Christ, in his indivisible Divine-humanity, must as regards his body also be omnipresent, as God is. Against Zwingli's attempt to make a separation between the two Natures, Luther sets the *communicatio idiomatum*: the unity of the two natures in Christ means that what is said of one nature applies also

---

not that I seek him there, by throwing myself into the fire or the water, or hanging myself with the rope; he is everywhere, but he wills not that you seek him everywhere, but there, where the word is; seek him there, and you will truly find him. Otherwise, you are tempting God and committing idolatry. Therefore he has set before us a certain way, how and where we are to seek him—namely, his word."—XIX. p. 492.

[1] A little before, Luther has thus set out his adversary's position: "If we now ask them, what they mean by God's right hand where Christ sits, I suppose they will start talking in a fanciful way, like one who is inventing for the children a fairy-heaven, where stands a golden throne, and Christ sits near his Father in a cope and a golden crown, as the painters paint him. For if they had not just such childish and carnal thoughts as these about God's right hand, they would never take such offence at the presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist . . . from which childish thoughts it necessarily follows that they fix God also to one place in heaven, on a golden throne. Apart from Christ there is no God, and where Christ is, there the Godhead is wholly."—XXIII. p. 131.

[2] "Therefore he must necessarily himself be in every creature, outside and inside it, all around it, through and through, above and beneath, before and behind, so that there cannot be anything more present nor more inward in all creatures than God himself in all his power."—XXIII. p. 134.

to the other.[1] The argument may be scholastic in tone; nevertheless, as in the case of the Nicene Christology, its object is to safeguard fundamental religious values.

Applied to the eucharist, this view finds expression in the doctrine of the Ubiquity of Christ's presence. Here again Luther makes use of the scholastic definition of the various sorts of being; light and colour, which are present to visual perception, the tree which is potentially present in the seed, God who can be present in the heart, suggest other possibilities than the crudely local conception of existence. Following Ockham, he defines three sorts of being: *circumscriptive*, as of wine in a jar; *definitive*, as of the demons of the Gospel, dwelling in men, or as of angels and spirits; and *repletive*, as of God who fills all things, yet is not himself in any place.[2] But while Ockham had defined the sacramental presence of Christ's body *definitive*, Luther goes one step further, from "multivolipresens" to "omnipresens," and defines it *repletive*. Is not this, at bottom, simply an effort to correct the local conception of the Divine being, and to lift the thought of the real presence from the sphere of mythology up to that of religion? Ubiquity is the omnipresence of the Incarnate God. Luther expresses this idea in a way which might appear to be pantheistic if it were isolated from its context, and from the problem of the sacrament which the doctrine was intended to answer. But it is in the eucharist that the presence is to be apprehended, for there we have Christ's word.

It is worth noting that this treatise shows signs of direct influence from the sacramental ideas of the early church. Evidently the controversy with the Swiss Reformers had driven him to a study of the Fathers; probably Erasmus' edition of Irenæus, published in 1526, was useful to him.[3] Through these studies the Johannine, immanental view of the sacrament reached him indirectly, and he now speaks of the elements no longer as signs or pledges, but as direct channels of divine power, and even accepts and never afterwards gives up the primitive thought of the sacrament as the medicine of immortality and the guarantee of the resurrection of the body. Even Luther did not escape the dangers which beset the study of the problem of the local presence of the Divine being.

---

[1] Seeberg, IV. i. p. 382 f.

[2] Cf. Hunzinger, art. "Ubiquität" in *Prot. Realencyc.*, Vol. XX.

[3] Köstlin, I. 453 f; Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, I. 500. Köhler points out that the idea of the real presence is expressed in this book in a more spiritual manner than before, and regards this as a concession made by Luther to his opponents. It would perhaps be truer to say that the objections which they had made against his carnal ideas gave Luther occasion to express more clearly than before the deeply spiritual conception of the Godhead which was always his.

Replies from both Œcolampadius and Zwingli provoked Luther's fullest treatise on the eucharist—*Von Abendmahl Christi, Bekenntnis* (1528). It is largely taken up with controversial exegesis, which is now only of secondary interest; the main arguments are the same as before. He energetically repudiates the false materialism of Zwingli's conception of God,[1] and denies that heaven is a place: "that which is in God or in God's presence is in heaven." A new point is his criticism of Zwingli's theory that the words of institution contain the rhetorical figure of *alloiosis*, that what is true of one of Christ's natures is said of the other or of both. Not without reason he sees here a deep Christological difference, and finds in Zwingli's doctrine a threat against the reality of the Incarnation and the Atonement. He works out his own doctrine of the sacrament in closest connection with the Incarnation; as in the *De captivitate* he treats the union of the bread with the body of Christ as closely parallel to the union of the two natures in Christ's person.

Here we reach what is without doubt the deepest difference between Luther and Zwingli: they have different conceptions of God. Zwingli's conception, with its harsh transcendence, effectually excludes any sort of sacramental religion; Luther's immanental view stands in the authentic tradition of the Christian idea of God. It was surely his intuitive grasp of this fundamental difference that gave Luther's polemic its impassioned tone; for the Zürich liturgy had already shown the poverty of Zwingli's sacramental doctrine. This deep conflict, however, between two widely different conceptions of God, of which Luther's is beyond question the more spiritual, does not lie altogether on the surface of the controversy; it is partly hidden behind the dispute about the words of institution. But any treatment of the subject which does not keep the real and fundamental issue always in view is bound to beg the question.

---

[1] "Thirdly, he shows clearly the crude foolishness of his ideas, in that he thinks of God's omnipresence just as though God were a great extended substance, which fills the world completely and sticks out at the end of it, like a sack full of straw with some straw sticking out at the top. . . . Then indeed Christ's body would be only a fancy and an illusion, like an immense sack of straw, containing God and the heaven and the earth. Would not this be a coarse, crude way to speak of God? But we do not mean this: we say that God is not an extended substance of this sort, with length, breadth, thickness, height, and depth, but a supernatural, incomprehensible substance, which at once is wholly in each single seed, and yet is in all his creatures, and over them all, and outside them all; there is no need, therefore, of any 'encircling' as the spirit (Zwingli) dreams, for one body is far, far too large for the Godhead, and many thousand Godheads might be contained in it, and again it is far, far too narrow, so that one Godhead could not be contained in it. Nothing is so small but God is smaller; nothing is so great but God is greater. . . ."—XXVI. 339.

And again, "What a childish, silly idea they have of heaven, making for Christ a place up in heaven, like a stork's nest up in a tree."

It is not necessary here to go into Luther's later writings on the eucharist. Both his main lines of thought are developed; thus the emphasis on the forgiveness of sins recurs in the *Greater Catechism* (1529); and no new points of view appear. To the last, however, his condemnation of Zwingli's doctrine never lost any of its vigour.

We have maintained that the energy with which Luther fought for the real presence is only intelligible on the supposition that he felt that vital religious values were at stake. It has been held, however, that it was bondage to the letter of the Scripture that impelled Luther to his conflict with Zwingli.[1] It is true that some of his sayings might lend colour to this view, such as the well-known words from his letter to Strassburg in 1524: "I am shut up and cannot escape. The text is too strong for me, and will not suffer itself to be torn from its meaning by words." But in other cases Luther was quite capable of asserting his freedom in regard to a biblical text; the texts which bound him were those which awoke an echo in his own convictions.

For us the exegetical proofs of this controversial literature have lost most of their interest; yet amidst the undergrowth of dialectic and the weeds of invective we find rich springs welling up out of the depths of genuine religious experience. They spring out of the same rich faith in God which has always been the hall-mark of Christianity; a God whose exalted spirituality is not inconsistent with his care for the temporal world and his use of material means in his operation. It was the false idea of spirituality in Carlstadt and Zwingli that provoked Luther; he saw there a threat to the Incarnation itself.

The doctrine of Ubiquity has no good name in modern theology. Yet at bottom is it not essentially an effort to lift the thought of the Incarnation above time and space, and treat it as a fact in the eternal world, while at the same time it is the sign that God has willed to take to himself his whole created world? Do not its clumsy phrases cover an intuitive grasp of the very essence of the Christian conception of God, with its vital union of the contrasted opposites of immanence and transcendence? It is this combination which the eucharist continually sets forth, and the experience of which constitutes the element of Mystery in the eucharist. This was the centre of Luther's religion; but he was forced to find ways of expressing himself in the forms of thought that lay ready to hand, forms that belonged to a lower level of thought than his own. He was forced to use the "localised" phraseology; and he asserted in its crudest form the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ. Yet in his refutation of the localised conception of God, which he found in Zwingli, and in his exposition of the various modes of being, he did in fact remove the objections to the doctrine; for the corporeity which, according to him, is omnipresent, *definitive* and *repletive*, is scarcely corporeal in any modern sense of the word. It must be admitted, however, that neither Luther nor his disciples escaped from the dangers of a false localisation of the presence due to an inadequate terminology.

---

[1] Jacoby, *Die Liturgik der Reformation*, I. 206; Goetz, *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage*, p. 51. Cf. also Harnack, *History of Dogma*, VII. p. 223.

Perhaps we might venture to say that what Luther is really trying to assert is just the personal identity between the exalted Lord, whose presence is experienced in the sacrament, and the historical Saviour of the Gospel. Doubtless Luther himself, if such a formula would have been intelligible to him at all, would have discerned in it some cunning device of Satan; nevertheless, it would seem that some such formula is the true expression in modern language of the permanent religious value of Luther's doctrine of the real corporeal presence.

In comparison with Luther's own work, the later confessional writings are of secondary importance. Their background is partly to be found in the attempts at reconciliation between the Lutherans and the Reformed churches which political conditions appeared to necessitate, but which actually threatened ideas that were considered of vital importance to faith. The *Augsburg Confession* and its *Apology* strove to show the catholicity of the Lutheran eucharistic teaching, and the *Articles of Schmalkalden* were equally definite and harsh in their repudiation alike of Roman and of Reformed teaching, on the one hand scornfully rejecting transubstantiation, and on the other boldly asserting that the unworthy communicant really receives the body and blood of the Lord (*manducatio indignorum*). It was the influence of the Reformed doctrine on Melanchthon and his disciples that led to the more definite expression of the Lutheran doctrine of the sacrament; it was thus that the well-known formula, "in, with, and under," came into existence, and in the *Formula Concordiæ* the doctrine of Ubiquity was finally asserted. This was the work of a rising Lutheran scholasticism rather than of a living creative faith. But it stands as an important attempt to safeguard the religious values of Luther's sacramental teaching.

2. Lutheran Forms of Service.

Early Attempts at Revision, up to 1525.

On the liturgical side the Lutheran Reformation showed little creative power; and this is especially true of Luther himself. The conservative and the unpractical side of his mind comes out in the fact that he was never really interested in liturgical forms; to him they were indifferent things, wherein a man might be content to conform to the established usage. He could dream of an ideal church in which complete freedom would be allowed; and even when he was most violently attacking the Sacrifice of the Mass, he never allowed himself to condemn wholesale its ceremonial setting. In this early period he never thought of ritual as having more than an educative value. When he was driven by force of circumstances to undertake liturgical composition he came to a more positive estimate of the historic forms of the liturgy; but he never attained to any real liturgical insight. As early as 1520, as we have seen, he came to regard mass in the vernacular as desirable; but he took no steps to carry out the idea till it was forced on him from the outside.

In the early years the movement was content with merely removing whatever in the service was directly offensive; that is, primarily the idea of the sacrifice. But since this was expressed chiefly in the canon, and the canon was recited in silence, in effect the problem concerned only the celebrant, and was left to be dealt with by individual priests. The only necessary requirement was that the *verba testamenti* should be audible.

For the rest, the mediæval expositions of the mass had shown how even mass without communion could serve to edification;[1] and the same point may be illustrated from the *De captivitate*, with its emphasis on the testament of the Lord which was proclaimed in every mass, and could be regarded as set forth even in the elevation. Emphasis was laid on communion; but even a private mass could be justified as the priest's own communion; and while as yet the demand was not made for a communion of the people at every mass, it was possible to find help in "spiritual communion"—even if the risk might thereby be increased of actual communion being regarded as indifferent. Finally, we possess a number of private prayers for use at mass, dating from the first years of the Reformation, composed by Luther himself and by others.[2]

The first attempts at a reformation of the mass date from 1521. The first demand for a revision of the liturgy, and for communion in both kinds, was made by the Augustinian brothers, and a commission of theologians was appointed to study the question. Carlstadt, however, inflamed by popular excitement, anticipated its report in the masses which he celebrated at Wittenberg at Christmastide, 1521. Yet it seems certain that the only innovations were, that communion was given in both kinds, and that, at least at the mass on New Year's Day, 1522, the canon was omitted, the German language used (probably, however, only for the words of institution),[3] and the mass vestments laid aside.

The *Ordnung der Stadt Wittenberg*,[4] which was issued in Luther's absence on January 22, 1522, shows that this was only intended for a beginning. Rules are here given about images and altars; three altars, without images, are allowed in each church. Mass is to be celebrated not otherwise than as Christ celebrated the first of all masses; yet permission is given for the saying or singing of the Introit, *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, Collect, Epistle, Gradual, Gospel, Creed, Offertory (omitted in the Roth text), Preface and *Sanctus*, with variables *de tempore* but not *de sanctis*—in effect, therefore, the whole mass up to the canon. Then begins "the evangelical supper" (*das evangelisch mal*); if there are communicants, the priest proceeds to the consecration; if not, he may consecrate and himself receive, if he is disposed thereto; and the service ends with a collect, the post-communion or some substitute. The communicants may, if they will, receive both host and chalice in their hands. An appendix in the Roth text forbids the reservation of the sacrament in the church; for the sick, the sacrament is to be consecrated afresh each time in the sick man's presence, whatever the time of day. Here we have the origin of the form for the communion of the sick, which remained a characteristic of the Lutheran tradition.

---

[1] Smend, *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zur Luthers Deutscher Messe*, p. 12 ff.

[2] Smend, pp. 18, 26.

[3] Smend, p. 3: Fendt, *Der lutherische Gottesdienst des XVI Jahrhunderts*, p. 83 ff. n., 94; Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein zu Karlstadt* (Leipzig, 1905), I. 361.

[4] Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts*, I. 697 f. The document is extant as printed in 1522, and also in a copy, the Roth MS., which perhaps gives a more original form of the text.

Since Luther had himself propounded in the *De captivitate* the principle that the first eucharist should be the standard of all others—even though he seems to have been unwilling to follow it to its consequences—it can hardly have been the extent of the liturgical changes that provoked his wrath on his return from Wartburg. They were, in fact, a very moderate expression of the principles which he himself had laid down. His criticisms are well known: that a new law was being set up in the place of freedom, and that too little regard was being paid to weak consciences. But the real cause of his dissatisfaction must surely have lain deeper. Carlstadt had given communion without confession to all comers; and there is a similar tale of a village church, where out of fifty communicants, only five came to confession.[1] Such an abolition of the chief of all the existing safeguards against the profanation of the holy mysteries was not at all to Luther's mind; and in the *Invocavit*-sermons he preached on the peril of treating communion lightly, and urged the importance of confession. Thus his experience of this first attempt at liturgical innovation, and of the perils which it involved, seems to have strengthened his tendency to conservatism, and to have delayed and discouraged his own initiative in the work of liturgical reform. If he did not completely restore the old form of service at Wittenberg, the elevation was brought back into use, and the words of institution were again read in Latin.[2]

The oldest German mass that we possess is that which was compiled in 1522 as a communion-liturgy for the Carmelite brothers at Nördlingen by their Prior, Kaspar Kantz.[3] As this order contains only the *missa fidelium* with some introductory prayers, and no mention is made of introit, lections, creed or sermon in the proper sense, it is probable that the use of all these is taken for granted; but it is also possible that Kantz regarded them as superfluous at the brethren's communion, for which the rite was intended. It begins with an exhortation about communion by the celebrant or some other of the brethren, an invitation to confession of sins, an absolution, and a prayer for the celebrant. (It is the fact that this introduction corresponds to the *Confiteor* of the mass that suggests that Kantz really intended to omit the lections.) Then the priest is to kneel and repeat, alone, the *Veni Sancte Spiritus* in German—according to a common custom at the offertory in the diocese of Augsburg, to which Nördlingen belonged—and a prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit. Then follows the Preface, translated from the *Præfatio communis* of the Missal, *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*. Now comes the special characteristic of this rite, that a paraphrase of the *Quam oblationem* of the canon introduces the words of institution; then the Lord's Prayer, *Agnus Dei*, and a communion prayer, taken from the *Domine Jesu Christe, Filii Dei vivi* of the Missal. The priest receives the host—if he is to communicate—shows it to the communicants, and gives communion with the words, " See, beloved, this is truly the holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which for you was delivered to a bitter death. Take and eat this for your food, nourishment and sustenance unto eternal life." For the chalice: " Let us drink of the cup of salvation and call on the Name of the Lord "; and " See, this is truly the treasure of the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, whereby ye were redeemed. Take this and share it with one another, for the washing away of your sins." The thanksgiving after communion consists of the *Nunc Dimittis* or the *Te Deum*, and a collect (" O Lord, who never failest to help and govern . . .") and a version of the *Placeat tibi* of the Missal, in which self-oblation and the sacrifice of praise are substituted for the offering of the mass.

---

[1] Smend, p. 3. [2] Fendt, pp. 95, 108. [3] Smend, pp. 38 ff., 73 ff.

The year 1523 was a decisive year in the history of the evangelical liturgy. First, Thomas Müntzer of Allstedt in Thuringia produced a work which should secure him an honoured place in the history of the Reformation; a form for the mass and for the Divine Office, with variables for five seasons—Advent, Christmas, Passiontide, Easter, and Pentecost.[1] The sketch for the Divine Office deserves study, in view of modern attempts to restore the tradition of the Breviary in evangelical churches; but it must not detain us now.

The mass corresponds with the usual type of Lutheran rite. Of special interest, however, are the variable forms, for introits, collects, graduals, sequences (for Christmas, Easter, and Whitsun, translated into German verse, probably by Müntzer himself), proper prefaces and post-communions. An explanatory preface gives an interesting apologia for the daring attempt to provide a German liturgy, and also corrects the ritual in certain points, as in the statement that a whole chapter from the Bible ought to be read in place of the usual lections. The poverty of the actual prayers has provoked criticism: Müntzer was, however, simply following the style of the Latin collect, and this is only one instance of the strongly conservative character of the whole rite.

---

[1] Sehling, I. 472–507; Smend, pp. 99–105.

This service is one of the most interesting liturgical products of the Reformation period. It had considerable influence; it came into use at Brunswick,[1] and the Erfurt services of 1525 and 1526 were simply reprints of it. But Luther would have nothing to do with it, probably owing to his personal suspicion of its author, in whose liturgical work he scented a fresh outburst of Carlstadt's "fanaticism."

In the same year another German rite, with the title *Das Testament Jesu Christi*,[2] came out under Œcolampadius' name. In many respects this work presents an unsolved problem. Its nearest parallel is the Roman mass for Maundy Thursday; among other conservative features is an offertory prayer, and also a form of canon, in both of which the self-oblation of the worshipper occupies the place formerly filled by the sacrifice of the mass. Otherwise it reflects Luther's teaching of the period of the *Sermon vom neuen Testament*. However, there is much to suggest that it is not an order for the celebration of mass at all, but a devotional work, designed for use where the Latin mass was still celebrated.[3]

A more important fact, however, is that in this year Luther himself turned his hand to liturgical work.

Luther's Formula Missæ.

In March 1523 Luther announced in a sermon that in future mass was to be celebrated only on Sundays, unless anyone desired communion oftener; and the same spring he issued the treatise *Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts in der Gemeine*,[4] the purpose of which is to regulate the daily service. It begins with the characteristic Lutheran principle: "The

---

[1] Smend, p. 118 ff. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 49–57. [3] *Ib.*, p. 67.

[4] Sehling, I. p. 2 f. Luther's Works, XII. 31 ff.

Divine service, which is everywhere celebrated, has a fine Christian origin, just as much as the ministry of preaching." But it has been ruined by "hypocrites"; the first and worst abuse is, that God's word has not been heard in the churches, but only reading and singing; the second is, that "so many unchristian fables and lies" have been introduced. The daily mass is to cease; in its place instructions are given for the making of an evangelical breviary, with suitable provision for the reading and exposition of the Scriptures at mattins and vespers; there may be also a midday service if desired. On Sundays the mass is to continue, with communion of the people and sermon. But the detailed treatment of the mass is left to the *Formula Missæ et Communionis*, which came out in the autumn of the same year, 1523.

The introduction gives an important statement of Luther's attitude to the problem of revision. Hitherto he has endeavoured in his sermons and treatises to turn away men's thoughts from the godless ceremonies, but has refrained from drastic changes, continually hesitating, partly for fear of harming the weaker brethren, who ought not to be wrenched away violently from the old form of service, partly by reason of the "frivolous and presumptuous spirits, who rush forward like unclean swine, having no faith and no understanding, who delight in novelty for its own sake, and are disgusted when the novelty ceases." Yet now he believes the time to be ripe for a serious attempt to create new forms; not indeed that it was ever his intention to cast aside the old service, but only to cleanse it from its worst accretions and show how it can serve to edification.

The eucharist itself stands for him immovably firm, on the basis of Christ's institution. But primitive simplicity has in course of time been perverted out of all recognition by human inventions. Those parts of the service which can be attributed to the early Fathers, Luther finds to be good and praiseworthy; likewise most of the sung portions. But he empties the vials of his wrath over the Latin canon, whose incoherence he seems to have discerned;[1] above all, he attacks the great abomination, namely, the turning of the mass into a sacrifice, with all that followed in its train, sacerdotalism, private and votive masses. He further condemns other growths with which the liturgy had been disfigured in the later Middle Ages, such as the proses with which the *Sanctus* and *Gloria* were farced, and also the excessive splendour of ceremonial. For a criterion of what shall be retained and what discarded, the only principle is that the mass is not a sacrifice, but " a sacrament or a testament, or a blessing or eucharist,[1] or the Lord's table or Supper or memorial or communion, or whatever godly name one may choose to take, provided only that it be not defiled by being called a sacrifice or a work."

---

[1] "Loquor . . . de canone illo lacero et abominabili, ex multorum lacunis ceu sentina collecto . . . ."

Yet the practical use which he made of this principle was of a negative, passive kind. He had no idea of creating a full-toned expression of the evangelical eucharist, with the liturgical treasures of Christendom; the only material available was the Roman mass, as it stood at the end of the Middle Ages. It was not even his intention to compose a liturgy in German; the *Formula Missæ* proposed only a reformed Latin mass, purged of whatever would not bear an evangelical interpretation.

When Luther's test is applied to the Introits, they nearly all stand; so do the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*, and the Collects, Epistles and Gospels; if some day a vernacular mass is prepared, the choice of lections should be revised, but for the present the sermon must supply whatever is lacking. The use of lights and incense at the Gospel is left optional; the Gradual and *Alleluya* may be sung, one or both, and the latter need not be discontinued in Lent; but sequences and tropes he will have none of—thus anticipating the action of Rome in curtailing these—with the exception of the sequences for Christmas and perhaps for Pentecost. After the Gospel the Nicene Creed is to be sung as usual; the sermon may be preached either in this place or before the mass. But in these matters no law ought to be laid down, for all these parts of the mass " are in our hands and free, not being of Divine command, and therefore not essential to the mass."

But in the latter part of the mass Luther allows no such freedom. " From this point onwards nearly everything reeks of sacrifice. But in the middle of it all stand the words of life and salvation (the words of institution) like the Ark of the Lord in Dagon's temple." Here, therefore, the pruning-knife must be more rigorously applied; and of the latter half of the service only a torso is left. First, the whole Offertory disappears; the bread and wine may be prepared during the Creed or after the sermon; the mixed chalice may be used, but Luther prefers unmixed wine, as symbolising the purity of the Gospel. The *Sursum corda* follows, and the first half of the *præfatio communis*; the proper prefaces seem to be accepted tacitly, and they were certainly in use long after, when for some reason mass was celebrated in Latin.[1]

---

[1] " Benedictionem latine, eucharistiam græce."

But, while the Roman preface, like the Eastern, passes over to the *Sanctus* in words which express the share of the church on earth in the heavenly song of praise which Isaiah heard, Luther attaches the words of institution (beginning with *Qui pridie* as in the Missal) to the *per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum* of the mutilated preface. The words of institution are to be chanted by the priest in the tone used for the Lord's Prayer, and then the choir is to sing the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, during which the elevation is to take place.

The transposition of the *Sanctus* and the words of institution is without doubt one of the least successful of Luther's suggestions for reform. Two reasons are conceivable: either, because he was accustomed to attach the real presence to the words of institution, he felt an impropriety in singing the *Benedictus qui venit* at an earlier point;[2] or it may be simply that he found this to be a simple way of making a grammatical connection with the words of institution. In a variety of ways this arrangement has kept its place in various Lutheran liturgies; and the Swedish mass still perpetuates the false step.

The *Sanctus* is followed by the *Our Father*, without the embolismus or fraction, but with the *Pax*. This last was specially valued by Luther, and interpreted by him as a declaration of the forgiveness of sins, which is "the one worthy preparation for the Lord's table." It was a violent importation of his favourite idea into a phrase which was originally intended to convey a different meaning; but is it not another sign that the phrase "forgiveness of sins" had for him a deeper meaning than the words normally bear? The priest communicates himself, then gives communion to the people, with the Roman words of administration, while *Agnus Dei* is sung; the variable *communio* may be used, but there is a fixed post-communion. The *Ite missa est* is discarded, but *Benedicamus Domino* is to be used, with or without *alleluya*, and permission is given for the use of the Aaronic blessing (Numbers vi. 24)—"I believe that Christ used these words when he blessed his disciples at his Ascension." This is the origin of the extraordinary popularity of this form in the Lutheran part of Christendom. The use of the mass vestments is left optional.

---

[1] Sehling, I. pp. 281, 567.

[2] So Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, VIII. p. 84.

The second part of this work, entitled *De communione populi*, was of the greatest importance in determining Lutheran practice. First, the principle is laid down that no mass is to be celebrated without communicants. But the right to receive communion depends on certain conditions; Luther develops in a characteristic way the mediæval manner of "fencing the tables" by the Sacrament of Penance. The important point is that he adds a demand for definite religious knowledge; we may find here the seed of the strong educational interest of the Lutheran churches. For discipline's sake, everyone who wishes to communicate must give in his name to the priest, and only those may be allowed to receive "who can give an account of their faith, and answer questions such as whether they understand what the Holy Communion is, what it bestows, and for what purpose they desire to partake of it; that is to say, whether they can repeat by heart the words of institution, and declare that they come, troubled by consciousness of sin, fear of death, or some sore temptation of the flesh, hungering and thirsting to receive help and comfort from the Lord himself, through the ministry of the priest, by the word of salvation and the token thereof, even as Christ in his inestimable love gave to us, and ordained in the supper, when he said, Take, eat. . ." This examination need not take place more than once a year for each communicant; in some cases once in a lifetime is sufficient, in others it is altogether needless. His purpose is to set up some sort of safeguard, lest all without distinction, worthy and unworthy, rush to communion, as used to happen under the Roman church, without any trouble being taken to see that they had any better idea about the act than that it is a good work—or indeed any knowledge at all of the real "bread of life," the words of institution, which the church had kept carefully concealed. But Luther is not thinking of intellectual knowledge only; the priest is also to judge whether the communicant is proving by his life the genuineness of his faith. Open and impenitent sinners are to be excluded at once; but those who sometimes fall into sin, but grieve over their fall and desire to amend, are not to be refused; for it is for such sinners that the sacrament exists, that they may be restored to new life.

Private confession is not to be made compulsory, but

Luther insists here as elsewhere (*e.g.* in the *Invocavit*-sermons) on its value. It is not to be made into a new law, any more than the communion itself. The same principle applies to the usual manner of preparation, by the fast and by prayer. Sober indeed the communicant must be; but this is not the same as the mere observance of the formal fast. He must not come over-full of food and drink: "for the true preparation is . . . a soul beset by sin, death, temptation, hungering and thirsting for penance and strength."

At the service the communicants are to sit by themselves; their approach to the altar must be a public act, so that others may note whether their life is what it should be. Here we find an emphasis somewhat unusual with Luther: "The partaking of the Supper is part of the profession, whereby before God, angels, and men, we profess that we are Christians."

The energetic insistence on communion in both kinds is of less interest for us. Most important, however, is Luther's demand for hymns in the vernacular, which might be sung by the people side by side with or in place of the Latin chants in the mass, till such time as the whole mass could be in German. He advertises for German poets who could give to the church new spiritual songs; for of those which were available, only a very few were suitable for use.

The *Formula Missæ* can hardly be regarded as a step in advance when compared with such work as Thomas Müntzer's. In fact it was Luther's movement of reaction against Müntzer and Carlstadt which still restrained him from producing the German mass, which he admitted to be desirable. But the principles set forth in the *De communione* were to bear great fruit in the future; the examination before communion, the public character of communion, and vernacular hymns were to determine the character of Lutheran church life. These principles meet us again and again in the Church Orders of the sixteenth century.

However, the *Formula Missæ* came to be the norm of a whole group of German liturgies, which in general are of a richer character than those modelled on the later *Deutsche Messe*. These are to be distinguished from those which were worked out more or less independently, on the basis of Luther's teaching, such as the Strassburg service of 1524,[1] which had five proper prefaces, and allowed the Preface to lead up to the *Sanctus*, but was later developed under Bucer's influence more in the Zwinglian than the Lutheran spirit.

---

[1] Smend, p. 125 ff.; Fendt, p. 140 ff.

In other cases, such as the Prussian service of 1525 and the Nördlingen mass of the same year,[1] and even perhaps the Nuremberg rites,[2] it must remain doubtful to what extent they are dependent on the *Formula Missæ.* The question is very complicated; thus, Döber's mass[3] (at Nuremberg) was intended not as a high mass, but as a communion mass, to replace an early low mass. A Confession and Absolution, with an exhortation, precede the introit; and another long exhortation occurs in the *missa fidelium* itself. From the liturgical point of view such an exhortation was a novelty of dubious value, even if this exhortation, which was widely copied, was excellent in itself and very much in Luther's spirit.

Luther's Deutsche Messe.

On October 29, 1525, mass was celebrated at Wittenberg for the first time in German according to Luther's own order, the same order which was published in the following year, with the title *Deutsche Messe und Ordnung Gottesdiensts.* It is important rather because it came out with Luther's own authority than for its liturgical merits; for in this respect it is inferior to many of the rites which had already been published. Luther had for a long time held back from the project, frightened by the example of the "fanatics," and doubtful of his own competence; besides, there was the danger that a German mass issued by him might become a new law and an external symbol of the Reformation. So he writes in the Preface to the *Deutsche Messe*; and in truth it was well for the Lutheran service that it could begin to develop spontaneously, apart from the influence of a standard form, such as Luther's daring spirit could hardly create without admitting rash novelties of the sort that we actually find in the *Deutsche Messe.*

The Preface shows also how unclear and contradictory his liturgical ideas still were. The reason surely was that the ancient service had a value for his religious sense which he was not able to justify logically from his theological premisses. He regards the value of a liturgy as almost wholly educative. Mature Christians need no external form of service, for they have it already in their hearts; outward ordinances are only for those who need to become

---

[1] Fendt, p. 132 ff.

[2] Smend, p. 180; Fendt, p. 156.

[3] Smend, pp. 163, 185 f. See also pp. 241–244 below.

Christians or to have their faith strengthened. Is it amiss to detect here an ironical note? Luther counts himself as one of those who are not yet Christians.

Above all, the liturgy is intended for the young and the simple, who need to be daily nourished and exercised in God's word. For their sakes, the Latin service of the *Formula Missæ* is not to be wholly discarded; indeed, it might be well sometimes to celebrate mass in Greek or Hebrew, if those languages had so many fine tunes and chants as the Latin. It is not good to hold the service only in the vernacular: "for I would gladly bring up young people who could serve Christ usefully even in foreign lands and talk with the people there; so that it might not be with us as with the Waldensians and the Bohemians, who have so imprisoned their faith in their own language that they cannot talk intelligibly with anyone else unless he learns their tongue. Not so did the Holy Ghost at the beginning; he did not wait till the whole world should come to Jerusalem and learn Hebrew, but bestowed all manner of tongues on the preachers, so that the Apostles could talk wherever they went. . . ." [1] These words sound like a foreboding of the provincialism which was to be one of the results of the Reformation.

But as a Latin service may be held for the young people's sake, so a public service in the vernacular is useful for the unintelligent multitude, "among whom are many who have not yet faith nor are Christians, but for the most part stand and gape when they see anything new; it is as if we were to hold service out on an open plain among Turks and heathens, for here there are no settled or ordered congregations of Christian people ruled according to the Gospel; it is rather a public invitation to come to faith and to Christianity."

In contrast with these two types of public service, Luther proposes his own special idea of a truly evangelical service, such as might be held in a select congregation where church discipline might be observed, the sacrament administered in simpler forms, and brotherly love be exercised by voluntary collections. But, he says, this ideal congregation cannot yet be established; the *personnel* is lacking, "and I do not see many who are shaping that way." He again avowed a similar ideal later; but the fact that he never made any effort to realise the ideal is, in fact, the best criticism of it. The ideal congregation presupposes, in fact,

[1] Luther's Works, XIX. p. 74.

a conception of the Church which was not Luther's; the idea not of a national church, but of a sect based on individual confession of faith.

Since Luther could not make up his mind to become the founder of a sect, the effect of the ideal of a truly evangelical congregation was to lead him to stress the didactic element in the service. Thus the desire is expressed in the *Deutsche Messe* for " a rough, plain, simple, good Catechism," and for a breviary-office with a purely didactic aim. The introduction to the mass itself reflects a somewhat puritanical spirit. Vestments, altars, and lights are retained for the time being, but the position of the altar ought to be changed, so that the celebrant might face the people " as Christ did without doubt at the Last Supper." [1] Such a proposal would assuredly have encountered no greater difficulties than did similar plans at Zürich or Strassburg; but here again we meet with Luther's strange indifference about these practical matters. Doubtless his dogmatic controversy with Zwingli accounts in part for his illogical attitude, and also his fear of making simplicity itself into a new law. But surely the true cause lay deeper still; for his subconscious sense the language of the old ceremonial was the expression of the sacredness of the Mystery, and therefore he dared not discard it.

The arrangement of the first part of the service is in most of the essential points similar to what we have already seen in the *Formula Missæ*. As before, the *Confiteor* is absent. The Introit may be sung in German, or be replaced by a German hymn. The *Kyrie* becomes threefold; a more serious change is that the *Gloria* disappears. The Collect is said facing the altar, the Epistle and Gospel remain as before. Rules are given for the music; it was one of Luther's problems to adapt the traditional music to German words. But the Gradual and *Alleluya* are replaced by a German hymn, and the Creed by Luther's metrical version, " Wir gleuben all an eynen Gott." After this the sermon follows; but " since preachers full of the Spirit are few," a homily may be read in its place; otherwise room was only being made for the coming in of " fanaticism " and the subjective interpretations of the preachers. It is remarkable that a form in which the didactic element is so prominent should not make the sermon into a central feature. At the same time, it is part of the importance of the *Deutsche Messe* that it did give the sermon a fixed place in the mass.

---

[1] The liturgical movement in the Roman church is now seeking to put this very idea into practice: Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, p. 428.

But it is in the latter part of the service that the contrast with the *Formula Missæ* is most marked. The sermon is followed by a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer. Such paraphrases had indeed been common in the writings of the Reformation, but Luther was the first to make this a feature of the mass. Then follows an exhortation, doubtless after the example of Strassburg and Nuremberg. But this exhortation is arranged so as to lead directly up to the words of institution, at the cost of an essential part of the old ritual of the mass. The Offertory had gone long before; now the Preface disappears also. From this point onwards there are two different types of Lutheran mass, whose distinguishing marks are the Preface and the Exhortation respectively, though some of the Church Orders combine both.

In the *Deutsche Messe* the paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer and the Exhortation may be read either from the pulpit or from the altar; but it is explicitly ordered that the words of institution, which are called " das ampt und dermunge " (office and consecration), are to be read at the altar. Luther states his preference that the bread and the wine should be consecrated and administered separately, and this practice had some following in Germany. During the communion German hymns are to be sung, and among these Luther's own paraphrase of the *Sanctus* is named and his German *Agnus Dei.* The elevation is retained " since it suits well with the German *Sanctus*, and means that Christ has commanded us to remember him "—the meaning is obscure, but the connection is interesting. Certainly the loss of the *Sanctus* in its old form is one of the gravest faults of the *Deutsche Messe.* Nevertheless, the use of the metrical paraphrase testifies even more directly how for Luther the eucharistic action is surrounded with the same " numinous " holiness, which made it natural for the ancient church to link with the celebration of the mysteries the song of the Seraphim to God's majesty. The service ends with a collect of thanksgiving and the Aaronic blessing.

The account which we have given should have made it clear that Luther's share in the development of the liturgy cannot be judged only by those forms which he himself produced. Other rites for which he was not responsible, and which he greeted with undeserved criticisms, nevertheless owed their origin to the impulse which he had given; and it is in some of these rites, particularly perhaps Thomas Müntzer's, that the Lutheran Reformation found its worthiest liturgical expression. We have noted weak points in Luther's own work: in the *Formula*, the dislocation of Preface and *Sanctus*; in the *Deutsche Messe*, the loss of both these, together with the *Gloria*, and the paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer with the following exhortation.

The great positive merit of Luther's work, especially the *Deutsche Messe*, is the introduction of German hymns. There is no need to stress the fact that these, with the rest of Luther's hymnody, form the chief contribution of the Lutheran Reformation to the treasures of the Church Universal. The creation of a sacred psalmody, which stands absolutely in the first rank, might of itself constitute a sufficient apologia, if such were needed, for the existence of the Lutheran type of service. On the musical side, Luther's contribution is that of genius; to this day it is a special glory of the Lutheran church that it both preserves the ancient Gregorian tradition and unites with it a collection of chorales and melodies inspired with the same churchly dignity, and not inferior in nobility. But this is a subject which lies outside our present study.

There is one root-fault which is common to all the Lutheran rites. They had no other model than the Roman mass; and their use of it was predominantly negative, limited to the omission of whatever was unsuitable, without any real attempt to provide an adequate substitute except in details. There is some truth in the oft-repeated accusation that the Lutheran mass has the character of a torso. The fault is not indeed that *this* model was chosen. On the contrary, it is a mark of Luther's real greatness and ripeness of judgment that not even his violent opposition to the sacrifice of the mass could obscure for him the value of the liturgical creation to which the sacrificial form, *canon ille lacer et abominabilis*, had been added, nor blind him to the expression in the liturgy of the awfulness of Mystery, which he was supremely anxious to preserve.

Luther's critics, however, commonly fall into the mistake which he himself avoided, of treating the idea of the sacrifice of the mass as inseparable from the mass itself. Yet after all the Roman mass is something more than an expression of the Roman type of religion; it is one form of the classical type of service of the Universal Church, of the great primitive liturgy, of which even the broken fragments which survive in all sorts of places, often indeed separate from the eucharist itself, never cease to proclaim their noble origin and their spiritual character. One is tempted to quote Horace's saying about a fragment of Ennius: " invenias etiam disiecti membra poetæ." Of the family of ancient liturgies, the Roman rite was a noble member. We saw in an earlier chapter how it added its own gift of an incomparably terse and pregnant style to the common inheritance of the Western liturgies, the development of the liturgical year; and both these gifts have in some measure at least been inherited by the Lutheran church.

But it is also true that the disfiguring outgrowths of the Roman mass had covered up, or rather destroyed, much material of the highest value in the Eastern and Gallican rites. The pruning-knife of the Reformation had to clear these growths away. But the richer treasures of the older liturgies were not recovered. Thus the operation left a gaping void; creative power was not available to reassemble the scattered fragments; and the door of the treasure-house from which a richer store might have been gathered remained closed. Luther himself does not seem to have known that any other ancient liturgies were in existence. Thus a central problem of the Lutheran rite still awaits its solution.

The Lutheran Church Orders.

The revision of the liturgy in Germany finally crystallised in the Church Orders. On the failure of the hope that the episcopate would take the lead in the rebuilding of church life, it fell to the authorities in the principalities and cities to give legal sanctions to the new order. In the politically divided state of Germany the result was an enormous mass of church legislation; in Sehling's collection this literature fills five large quarto volumes. The oft-repeated principle that unity in external ceremonies is not necessary saved a great number of details of usage from being sacrificed to a levelling uniformity. Nevertheless, there was a growing tendency to bind the forms of worship with legal sanctions; in such cases as the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Church Order of 1533, the aim was no longer merely to provide an adequate and worthy form for practical needs, but to ensure such a form of worship as the Divine presence in the sanctuary demands.[1] The result was a limitation of the variety and richness of liturgical forms, till the rites became simply variants of the types established by the early Lutheran masses and Luther's own work.

One group of churches was characterised by Lutheranism in doctrine and a Reformed type of liturgy, and thus falls outside the general Lutheran development: this is Württemberg, where the Church Order authorised in 1536 and revised by Brenz in 1543 shows a liturgical poverty comparable with Zwingli's own rite. Here the preaching-service preserved scarcely a trace of the old liturgy, and was followed once a month by a communion service, in which the didactic element was so prominent as to oust practically all other liturgical features. Yet the communion was always held in conjunction with the morning service till 1722; at Baden and Kurpfalz, however, they were made into separate services.

---

[1] Fendt, p. 216 f.

In the greater part of middle and north Germany the service came to be modelled on the *Deutsche Messe*, with the exception that the liturgical tradition was often treated more mercifully; thus *Gloria in excelsis* was in use at Wittenberg itself in 1536.[1] One series of North German Church Orders shows the influence of Bugenhagen; these show a preference for greater fixity of usage,[2] though a great deal of variety remains, the liturgies of Hamburg and Brunswick being simpler than the Danish, which was also Bugenhagen's work. Among the richest of Lutheran Church Orders is that of Brandenburg, 1540, a monument of the liturgical interests of Kurfurst Joachim II,[3] and Chytræus' Austrian liturgy of 1571, a valuable proof of the conscious effort of the later Lutheranism after a *via media*; and again, the liturgy of Riga, 1530, which shows the influence of the *Formula Missæ*.

It is, however, impossible for us to describe in detail the various liturgies; we have already seen the main types. It is more important for us to illustrate the regular features of the old-Lutheran type of service.

First and most important, the regular Sunday service was a full eucharist, with sermon and communion. It is true that it was necessary from the first to provide for cases in which no communicants had given in their names; for the rule of notice of communion made it possible to know beforehand whether the *missa fidelium* could be held. However, its omission seems to have been regarded as an exceptional contingency.

In middle and north Germany the communicants were ordered as a rule to take their places in the choir after the sermon, men on one side and women on the other; here a hymn was often sung, still called *offertorium*. At this point the two main types diverge, those modelled on the *Formula Missæ*, with or without the alteration in the place of the *Sanctus*, and those which followed the *Deutsche Messe*. Yet here also intermediate types occur; both Exhortation and Preface in Prussia and Pomerania, or an alternation of the two, the Preface being used on great festivals. There was no prejudice against Latin; sometimes both Preface and *Sanctus* were in Latin; sometimes (Erfurt; Mecklenburg, 1545) pains were taken to set proper prefaces in German to the musical notation. Where the *Deutsche Messe* was used, the versified *Sanctus* was commonly sung.

---

[1] Fendt, p. 192.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 212; Sehling, V. 528 f.

[3] Fendt, pp. 273–82.

The *Deutsche Messe* had undeniably the advantage of providing a better connection for the words of institution. In the other type there was a hiatus where the *Sanctus* followed the Preface; only isolated attempts were made to overcome this difficulty, and they were not imitated. It was everywhere required that the words of institution should be audible; Luther had suggested that they should be chanted. There was an increasing tendency to speak of these words as the "consecration." Though Luther used this phrase in the *Deutsche Messe*, he regarded them rather as a proclamation of the Gospel. But in the *Formula of Concord* we meet what is in effect the Roman idea of words of consecration, which must be said over the elements. In the seventeenth century the use of the sign of the cross over the elements was the regular practice throughout Germany. The sacring-bell was used at the consecration right into the eighteenth century; and for a long time it was customary for the whole congregation to fall on their knees for the consecration. Reconsecration is ordered in many of the Church Orders if the quantity of bread or wine consecrated proved insufficient. In spite of the principle *extra usum nullum sacramentum*, pains were taken to secure that all the consecrated elements should be consumed.

The practice of kneeling to receive communion is one of the chief points which give the Lutheran type of service its distinctive character; another characteristic is the retention of wafer-bread, as in the Roman church. The words of administration were similar to the Roman form: "The body of Christ preserve thy soul unto eternal life," as in the Nuremberg rite of 1525; or "Take this and eat, it is the body of Christ which was given for thee." No such words were required, however, when, as in Bugenhagen's Church Orders, the two elements were administered separately. During the communion the *Agnus Dei* or a hymn was sung; and some of the Church Orders mention the practice, common in the modern Swedish church, of giving the communicants a scriptural text after the distribution.

Occasional attempts were made, as by Müntzer, to provide a series of variable post-communion collects; the failure of later Lutheranism to follow this out has meant the loss of a valuable opportunity of enriching the liturgy by preserving the *de tempore* principle at this point. It is clear that a need was felt of allowing the note of praise to sound at the end of the service, at the least by *Benedicamus Domino* or a hymn. The Nuremberg rite had appointed the *Nunc Dimittis*, Kantz the *Te Deum*; the fact that these suggestions were not followed means probably that while there was still hope of preserving the tradition of the breviary-office, it was felt to be important that those services should not be robbed of two of their chief treasures.

As we have seen, Luther gave no decision for or against the use of mass-vestments. As a rule they remained in use during the early period; at Hamburg the chasuble was used till the eighteenth century; in many places a surplice was used both at the altar and in the pulpit, and this was often superseded quite early by the black gown, the daily dress of the learned professions. Where, however, the vestments were used, their special connection with the sacrament was remembered, and sometimes they were not put on till the beginning of the *missa fidelium*. At Magdeburg incense was used for the central part of the service, the censer being hung to one of the pillars of the choir; and this was by no means a unique archaism.

The formal rule of the fast before communion had been set aside by Luther in the *Formula*, but the value of the fast, as a voluntary practice, was far from being ignored; and the observance of it was made easier by the fact that the "high mass" was normally celebrated at 8 a.m. or even earlier.[1] At the same time it was regularly taught that the true preparation for communion was of another kind, and the importance of the Examination and of Penance was energetically urged; nowhere, perhaps, in Christendom have greater pains been taken to guard the holy mysteries from unworthy reception. As a rule these two practices went together. Luther had specially emphasised the first, but as time went on he came to insist more and more on the value of private confession and absolution, while never making it an absolute rule. No one seems to have been conscious of any incompatibility or opposition between it and the Examination. In this as in other ways the men of the Reformation showed a naïvely optimistic faith in the value of instruction. Given right knowledge about the sacrament, it was assumed that self-examination and a sense of sin would necessarily follow.[1]

---

[1] Kliefoth, VII. p. 398 f.

The requirement of a certain standard of knowledge as a condition of communion encouraged the Lutheran church in its educational interest. The central place given to Scripture and to preaching caused the didactic note to be emphasised in the life of the church in general, but the right to refuse communion pressed the point home. We cannot follow out this subject here; we must, however, mention that the work of instruction culminated in the preparation of young people for their first communion, with the final examination which in many places already in the sixteenth century came to take the place of the old Confirmation. The close association of this Confirmation with First Communion can be traced first, perhaps, in the Reformed churches.[2]

But a word or two more must be said about private confession. This practice was not limited in its use to a preparation for communion. Luther had wished to abolish compulsory confession, but at the same time he had valued confession very highly as a means for the quieting of troubled consciences. Yet its value as a ministry to souls was seriously damaged by the fact that it became in effect a condition of communion, and in result partly lost its spiritual character, and partly was thrown into the background by the Examination before communion. When dispensations from the Examination were granted to "respectable people," and when regard came to be had to such persons' worldly position, the decline of the system of Penance was certain to follow.[1]

---

[1] "No one is to be admitted to communion unless he has been to see the parish priest, who shall examine him whether he is rightly instructed about the sacrament. . . . It shall be taught that only those are fit to go to communion who have true grief and sorrow for their sins, and who have a troubled conscience; for rude people who have no fear (*rohe furchtlose Leute*) are not allowed to go, since it is written in I Cor. xi: Do this in remembrance of me. To remember the death of Christ is not merely to hear it proclaimed, but to be afraid, because God has manifested such wrath against sin, that he gave his Son over to death on account of sin, and no angel and no saint was able to make atonement for sin, but Christ, who himself is God, must needs offer himself . . . O what awful punishment shall fall on those who regard sin so little, even though they hear that God himself regards it so much!"

Instruction to Visitors and Pastors, 1528—Sehling, I. p. 160 f.

[2] Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, I. p. 839.

As a rule Penance was administered in the church some day before the communion-Sunday; in the end the practice came to be that the Saturday evening service became a preparation-service. The making of the private confessions was preceded by common prayer, with an address (*Beichtrede*); and when the number of penitents was large, confession became a pure formality, for the Examination, where it was held, was carried out on a previous occasion. In large towns especially it was often impossible to hear the confessions of all, and soon absolution came to be given to several at once; from this it was but a short step to the displacement of private confession by a general confession and absolution. In some places this had already happened in the sixteenth century, and private confession was an exceptional event. Certainly a hundred years later this was the common use. Other causes helped in the same direction, such as the revolt against the customary offering of the *Beichtpfennig* to the priest, and the dislike felt by the Pietists, under influence from the Reformed churches, to the unconditional absolution.

The decline of the penitential system of the old Lutheran church was now complete. There remained only the rule that the intending communicant must give notice to the priest, and be present at the preparation service.

3. An Estimate of the Lutheran Type.

Thanksgiving.

In the Middle Ages there had come a great cleavage between the Memorial-aspect of the eucharist and the Communion-aspect; and in the conflict between the two the former had prevailed. It was for the Lutheran Reformation to bring them again into unity. But it was only natural that the reaction should emphasise the side which had been neglected at the expense of the other; the Memorial-aspect found no adequate theological expression, and it was only the liturgical conservatism of the Lutheran movement that saved it from being altogether neglected. The Communion-aspect was treated as primary, and communion as the act whereby the memory of Christ's death is made and the sacrifice of praise offered.

---

[1] Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen*, p. 373 ff. Caspari, art. " Beichte " in *Prot. Realencyc.*, II. 536 ff.

It was this way of approach that conditioned the Lutheran treatment of the offering of praise and thanksgiving. Luther repeatedly spoke of the sacrifice of praise as the only form in which the idea of sacrifice could be admitted in an evangelical view of the eucharist; somewhat grudgingly indeed, and rather as a concession to the opposite party, and an effort to find some place after all for the hated idea of sacrifice. But it was impossible to forget the central place which the thought of the sacrifice of praise had held in the early church. Melanchthon was indeed more willing than Luther to see an objective value in the liturgical action of the eucharist as a whole, and treat the whole service as an act of thanksgiving and of commemoration;[1] and the idea of the sacrifice of thanksgiving is expounded at length in the *Apologia for the Augsburg Confession* (Art. XXIV: *De Missa*). But he made a distinction, which was to have a disastrous influence on Lutheran thought, between *sacramentum* (God's gift, the symbol and means of grace) and *sacrificium* (oblation, man's response—including prayer, preaching, thanksgiving, "the sufferings of the saints"). Since Kliefoth's day this became an accepted division of the elements of Christian worship among Lutheran theologians.

But this distinction is fatally misleading as an account of the eucharistic aspect. Those who started with regarding the service as, first and last, the reception of God's gift by the individual, could only think of it as a sacrifice of praise in a very limited sense; on the other hand, the lively sense of God's mercies which was the result of communion must immediately call forth thankfulness, and make communion itself an act of grateful obedience; and Luther himself had spoken in precisely the same way. The actual result was the insertion of a wedge which was ultimately to drive out the element of thanksgiving from the Lutheran service, as it tended also to drive out that of Fellowship. Opposition to the idea of the sacrifice impelled Lutheranism to lay all the emphasis on the gift given to the individual in communion. The gift to the individual came to be treated as the whole purpose of the service. The result was the individualistic outlook, which came to dominate the Lutheran view of the sacrament, and has ended, in many

---

[1] "Fatemur totam actionem cœnæ Domini sacrificium laudis, seu, ut vocant, commemorationem esse; et ea quæ ad talis sacrificii substantiam pertinent, omnia retinentur in nostris ecclesiis."—*Corpus Ref.*, IV. 313.

Lutheran churches, by driving out the eucharist from its place as the chief service. But the proper and primitive meaning of the eucharist is that it is the church's corporate act of praise, culminating in the eucharistic thanksgiving for the objective fact of redemption; and it is this which the church of to-day and to-morrow must seek to recover.

Thus Lutheran individualism has tended to deprive the eucharist of its robes of thanksgiving; and other factors have assisted the result, particularly the great emphasis which it has laid on penitence. The assurance of the forgiveness of his sins might indeed fill the cleansed sinner with humble thankfulness, but it could hardly liberate the fuller note of praise which would be the natural result of a more positive expression of communion with God; and in any case it would be the individual's thanksgiving for individual blessings, not the church's great common act of praise.

It is indeed true that so long as the eucharist continued to be the chief service, it retained much of its vesture of joy. It was a familiar idea with the Reformers that the church's service as a whole is a sacrifice of thanksgiving. In this sense most of the sung portions of the mass, the *Gloria*, *Alleluya*,[1] Creed, preface, *Sanctus*, were for Luther pure praise and thanksgiving, " for which reason we keep them in the mass "; and even the *Agnus Dei*, " because he has borne our sins." Again, the vernacular hymns opened up new possibilities for congregational praise, and communion hymns were written. But it is typical of the Lutheran eucharistic hymns that they express the gratitude of the individual for the gift received in communion, and not the eucharistic offering of the church.[2]

Thanksgiving was originally so essential a part of the sacred rite that it could give its name to the whole; and it came gradually to fill the service from end to end with praise, while the eucharistic prayer remained as its centre. Then, step by step it was forced away from the centre, as the Roman canon came to be dominated more and more by the thought of sacrifice. The process thus begun was carried further by Luther; the *Formula Missæ* broke the connection of preface and *Sanctus*, and the *Deutsche Messe* abolished them both, substituting for the latter Luther's German adaptation.

---

[1] Luther wished this to be sung throughout the year: "Alleluia enim vox perpetua est ecclesiæ, sicut est memoria passionis et victoriæ eius."

[2] The contrast is very striking between the mediæval hymn " Jesus Christus nostra salus " and Luther's adaptation, " Jesus Christus unser Heiland."

Thus Thanksgiving had to make way for individualism and penitential gloom, and the eucharist lost a great part of its former glory. To recover the note of praise, and let it ring out at the central point of the service, is an ideal for the church of to-day to achieve. She may not refuse, on the ground that her sick condition renders her unworthy to sing that song of praise. For it is not her own worthiness for which she is called to give thanks, but God's redemptive work.

Communion.

No aspect of the mass had been so neglected in the Middle Ages as Communion-fellowship; at this point, at any rate, the Reformation was positive and constructive. We have seen the magnificent expression in Luther's early writings of the fellowship of the body of Christ: that through communion the faithful are united with their heavenly Lord and with one another and with the church of all lands and of all generations. It was the rediscovery of the Pauline conception of the mystery of Christian fellowship; and here, as there, there was no sense of any inconsistency between the two meanings of "the body of Christ." But this conception never came to mean for the Lutheran Reformation what it might and should have meant. It was never formally given up, but it was allowed to fall into the background.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the communion of the people was triumphantly restored in the Lutheran eucharist. "No mass without communicants" is the principle of every one of the Church Orders. At Wittenberg it was ordered that, as the castle chapel was not a parish church, mass should not be celebrated there even on Sundays;[1] the priests attached to the chapel were to receive communion in the parish church. The energetic uprooting of private masses and the restoration of the communion of the people to the central act of worship are the great achievements of the Lutheran Reformation, in comparison with which the technical faults of the liturgies are mere trifles. This involved such a revolution in church practice, and such an increase in the number of communions, and it gave to the act of communion so central a place in religious life, that it is amazing that it can ever have been carried through. It is not surprising that we hear laments over the shortage of communicants, or that exhortations to perseverance were needed; for it was the Lutheran Reformation that first set to work to revive the primitive ideal of frequent communion, which in the Middle Ages had been all but completely forgotten outside the monasteries. Other important features of the aspect of Fellowship are the introduction of the vernacular, which restored to the congregation an active part in the service; and Luther's demand that communion should be a public act, " an act of confession before God, angels, and men, that we are Christians."

---

[1] Except when the Elector or the Court desired to receive: Sehling *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, I, 698.

But though the idea of Communion-fellowship found this splendid expression in church practice, it failed, except in a few isolated instances, to find a place in the doctrinal formularies. In Luther's writings it was forced into the background by the exigencies of the Zwinglian controversy, which drove him to concentrate attention upon the real presence in the elements, and thus to make a separation between the spiritual body of Christ, which is the fellowship of the faithful, and the real body, which is given in the sacrament. The element of mystery now assumed the dominant place in his eucharistic teaching; and, not being allowed to draw the idea of fellowship within its own circle, it threw it aside and drove it far from the centre. The result was the same unfortunate individualism which we observed in the Lutheran treatment of Thanksgiving. The Divine gift in communion was treated as a gift exclusively to the individual, who came to meet with his Lord in the sacrament and to have communion with him. The terrifying ethical earnestness of the system of self-examination and penance tended in the same direction; it obscured the social as well as the eucharistic side of communion. It was the same with the Testament-idea; for though a skilful preacher might make a telling paradox out of the thought that the riches of this Testament are not diminished however much its heirs are increased in number, the fact of the paradox shows how little natural connection there was between the idea of the Testament and communion.

The result is then curiously parallel to the case of eucharistic thanksgiving. At the re-birth of sacramental life at the Reformation, the idea of Communion-fellowship begins by filling the whole service with its inspiration, but ends by being refused a place within it. It is already evident in what direction the development is tending; it is towards the modern view, for which the retention of the eucharist as the chief public service is altogether an anomaly. But the point of view from which this book is written demands a precisely opposite aim: namely, to restore the communion-service as the central act of public worship, and thereby to save the depth and the sanctity of the idea of fellowship itself, allowing it to grow from the conception of a social fellowship tinged with religion, to that of a spiritual participation in the life of the universal church of all lands and of all ages. Sacramental fellowship only gains its deepest meaning when it is no longer thought of as a hindrance to the spiritual life of the individual, and it is seen that it is only in the fellowship of the body that the individual truly finds himself.

Commemoration.

In our study of the historical aspect of the Christian liturgy we have observed two conflicting tendencies: on the one side, the memory of the passion and death of Christ, and on the other the reflection in the Christian liturgy of the historical life of the church.

To the men of the Reformation it was so self-evident that the eucharist was celebrated in memory of Christ's death, that it scarcely seemed worth while to linger over the mere history, when its meaning was of infinitely greater import. Thus the thought of the cross became the thought of the Atonement; and by the side of that tremendous reality it was hard for any less central historical memory to find a place. Hence in the Lutheran eucharist immense emphasis, and exclusive emphasis, was laid on the words of institution. It is true to say that in its intense concentration of attention upon the cross, Lutheranism was but continuing and exaggerating the passion-mysticism of the later Middle Ages; for, if in the one case the ascetical imitation of the suffering Christ was the central thought, and in the other the trustful acceptance of the completed redemption, there was much in common between the two. In both cases the contemplation of Christ crucified tended to narrow down the wider historical outlook of an earlier age.

All this applies in full measure to the eucharist; and indeed the historical perspective of the traditional liturgy was only saved from being wholly lost by the conservatism of the Lutheran movement in liturgical matters. The general scheme of the mass was retained, and with it a whole host of historical associations, which became also in Lutheranism a symbol of its continuity with the early church and with the Old Testament. The Epistles and Gospels kept their place in spite of local efforts to introduce *lectio continua*;[1] and thus the liturgical year became one of the distinguishing marks of Lutheranism as contrasted with the Reformed churches. The loss of the Sunday Gospels would have made the eucharist into a communion service with no historical commemoration except the Last Supper. It is true that the calendar was drastically cut down; but some revision was necessary for practical reasons as well as on grounds of principle, and the Scriptural commemorations, including the festivals of Apostles, were for the most part saved. Nor was the work of the Reformation at this point wholly destructive. In more recent times a place has been found in the liturgical year for the festival of the Reformation itself, as the great revival of life; and the peculiar solemnity with which Good Friday has always been observed in the Lutheran churches corresponds to the central place of the Atonement in their teaching.

On the other hand, it is true that the *de tempore* principle as a whole became considerably less prominent in the Lutheran rites. It was of little importance that the Introits and graduals were lost, for the vernacular hymns that took their place were selected to suit the season. But the loss of the post-communion collects was a needless waste of useful material, and the same may be said of the communion antiphons, which were replaced by a narrow range of hymns, all relating to the Passion or to communion. The loss of the proper prefaces was much more serious; for even in the rites which followed the *Formula Missæ* the preface was generally invariable, except where the Latin prefaces remained in use in the sixteenth century, and in those which followed the *Deutsche Messe* there was no preface at all. Proper prefaces are far from being a liturgical luxury; they serve to set the day's commemoration at the centre of the eucharistic thanksgiving, and thereby widen and enrich the act of thanksgiving itself. The disappearance of the canon involved the loss of the relics of the ancient Diptychs which it enshrined; but since the canon had been recited inaudibly, the congregation were at this point no worse off than before. The old-Lutheran churches did not attempt to order a list of names of living and dead persons to be read at the eucharist; but the omission was a matter of accident rather than of principle.

On the whole, we have every reason to be thankful that the Lutheran Reformation treated the historical element in the ancient service as generously as it did. The actual result of the use of the vernacular, together with the prominence of the didactic element both in the sermon itself and in the preparation for communion, was that to the great mass of church-goers the broad historical lines of the story of redemption, the lines that led to Sinai and to Calvary, were presented far more intelligibly than in the Middle Ages. But the further point, which is still not yet generally understood, is that the historical elements of the liturgy are much more than a mere ritual, or mere survivals of the past, whose presence in the church service may be tolerated; on the contrary, they have a positive religious importance, and deserve to be both treasured and added to. In the mystery of the sacrament the story of redemption is apprehended as possessing an eternal truth; but for that very reason it must be commemorated in the liturgy in its historical setting. At this point there is a further value even in the less secondary historical associations of the liturgy, and even in its venerable antiquity, by the fact that they serve to place the central historical commemoration in its true perspective; and, further, they connect themselves with the sense of Christian fellowship, with the solidarity of the whole body of Christ, which embraces not only the present but also past generations, for whom the same eucharist was the means of union with the Crucified, and who are now at rest.

---

[1] Cf. pp. 114, 241, 245.

Sacrifice.

At no point was Luther so violently opposed to the mediæval system as in his repudiation of the Romish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass. This was the spear-point of his assault, and this was the cause of the immense emphasis which he laid on communion. Yet even so, Luther's modern critics are prepared to accuse him of half-heartedness, and of failure to draw the full consequences of his own declaration, that of the eucharistic sacrifice "nothing is left." [1] Thus, as we have seen, he allows a place to the sacrifice of praise, though he connects it exclusively with the act of communion. Again, as Goetz points out,[2] he is unable to escape from the sacrificial idea in relating the eucharist to Christ's atoning death.

We have seen how the doctrine of the heavenly priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews finds an echo in

---

[1] P. 99 above.

[2] *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage*, p. 47.

Luther. There it is Christ who offers his sacrifice, not we; but Luther's thought goes on to find some place for an offering made by man, for since we are by the sacrament incorporated into Christ, we there "offer ourselves up with Christ," sharing in his sacrifice. Here he is in contact with the highest conception of the eucharistic sacrifice in the early church, the self-oblation of the church to God in union with the one sacrifice. But unfortunately he never worked out this idea fully, for the blossoming of this gracious and spiritual doctrine was cut short by the icy winds of controversy; and the failure of the Lutheran churches to recover the idea, either in liturgy or in doctrine, has led to their permanent impoverishment. For the sacrificial idea lies so near to the heart of Christianity that it can never be neglected with impunity. But any doctrine of a material presentation made by man to God must involve the paganising of the church's worship. The only conception of sacrifice which is beyond all criticism is that of the self-devotion of man himself to God; such is the one sacrifice of Christ, and such is the self-oblation of the humble communicant through him.

But Luther is by no means clear in his teaching about the relation of the eucharist to the one sacrifice; and in the violence of his reaction against the conception of each mass as a repetition of the one sacrifice, and an *opus operatum* having an independent value of its own, he gives up also the conception of the eucharist as an Act of Memorial. "Some," he says, "speak of the mass as a sacrifice because the one sacrifice which Christ once offered for us is there brought to mind; just as year by year we call Easter Day 'resurrectio' or 'resurrectionis diem,' and say, 'Christ is risen to-day,' not meaning that Christ rises afresh every year, but that every year the day of his resurrection is commemorated. In this sense St. Augustine calls the sacrament a sacrifice."[1] But Luther repudiates this *Deutopfer*, or symbolical sacrifice, as much as the *Werkopfer*, or real sacrifice; for either it is meaningless to speak of a mere commemoration as a sacrifice, or the act turns out to be a *Werkopfer* after all. It was only natural that the awful example of the Roman mass should make it impossible for Luther to retain the idea of the Act of Memorial; it was as undeniable that the Act of Memorial was not a sacrifice in the proper sense, as that the sacrificial action in the mass had in fact been degraded to a pagan level. Further, it may seem that history itself proves the untenability of the distinctions whereby Roman theology in its better moments has sought to purify the doctrine of the eucharistic offering.

---

[1] Goetz, p. 46. Luther's Works, Weimar edition, XXIII. p. 272.

One of the most interesting of such attempts is that of the *Liber Ratisbonensis* of 1541, when for a moment it seemed that a *rapprochement* between the old system and the new was possible. Here the eucharistic sacrifice is summed up under four heads:[1]

(i) It is the church's ever-renewed presentation, *repræsentativo nomine*, of the one sacrifice, which can never be repeated, but has an eternal efficacy, and still avails for those who in faith show it forth before God.

(ii) It is the church's self-oblation to God, as Christ's mystical body; in thankfulness for the sacrifice of the cross, whereby alone man is saved from perdition, the church dedicates herself to God. "And since she reaches out her branches to the past, the present, and the future, and includes among her members not only those who now live by faith, but also those who have passed away in the sign of faith; therefore, when the church, in this supreme oblation which she makes through the outward ministry, calls to mind how Christ once died that he might be the Lord of dead and living, then she does not divide herself, but rather gathers herself, as it were, into one, and remembers not only those there present, but also the Saints (who as she surely knows are alive unto God), and other brethren and sisters who are fallen asleep in the Lord, but not yet fully purified; and she testifies that in this oblation she intends the unity of Christ's mystical body."

(iii) It is a sacrifice of praise.

(iv) It includes the material offerings of bread and wine and other gifts to the poor; "For it is fitting that the people should not only in word dedicate themselves to God, but also testify by some external token that they wholly give themselves to God."

The *Book of Ratisbon* was doomed from the start; it satisfied neither Wittenberg nor Rome. To the Reformers it was unacceptable because it was an apologia for the canon of the mass, which had become to them a symbol for the sacrifice of the mass in the accepted sense. Thus Melanchthon,[2] in his *De sacramento et missa* of the same year, refused to recognise any other sense than the sacrifice of praise, even though he was willing to extend this phrase to cover the whole action of the service, and not limit it to the communion.

---

[1] Jacoby, II. 66 ff.

[2] II. 69 ff.

But though the principles expressed in the Ratisbon formulæ could not be accepted at the time, they well deserve reconsideration to-day. The second point is an unusually forceful presentation of the Augustinian conception which had appeared in Luther's early sermons. The first is concerned with the Act of Memorial; and though in its effort to concede as much as possible to the Roman view, it might appear at the first glance to treat the Memorial-act as if it were a separate act of sacrifice, the idea expressed is, in fact, consistent with evangelical doctrine. We have seen how in the Gospel records the Memorial-aspect is as essential as that of communion; and that the thought of the sacrament as the *verbum visibile* points in the same direction.

In Luther's day controversial needs rendered it impossible that he should allow any place to the Memorial-aspect. But the case is different now; to-day the enemy is no longer the Roman canon and the abuses that had followed in its train, but rather the impoverishment of faith and of worship. The church of to-day has no grounds for refusing a place to this side of the eucharist; rather she needs to aim at recovering the evangelical conception of the sacrament in its completeness, and drawing out the implications of Luther's own teaching and old-Lutheran practice.

Luther evolved the idea of the Visible Word in connection with his view of the sacrament as the seal of Christ's Testament. The Testament-idea has indeed no natural relation with the act of communion, but it connects itself naturally with the Memorial-aspect, since it interprets the eucharist as a sort of acted sermon on the sacrifice of Christ. And when old-Lutheranism preserved the eucharist as the chief service, it followed that at least for the non-communicants its dramatic aspect became primary; and the same is involved in the retention of the elevation, for which Luther found an evangelical interpretation, of the mass-vestments, and the ceremonial setting in general. Those who were not to communicate were never required to withdraw; their presence was regarded as natural and desirable, and was enjoined by Luther himself; "those who cannot or do not desire to receive should yet remain and see the sacrament received, and hear God thanked and praised." At Wittenberg, as at Constantinople in Chrysostom's day, we hear of complaints that some went out of church after the sermon; and many of the Church Orders expressly state that all are to stay to the end. The exception is Württemberg, which, as we have seen, was under strong Reformed influence.

Lutherans constantly emphasised the value of the devout beholding of the communion; thus Justus Gesenius [1] encourages non-communicating attendance, because the sight of the communion can awaken us to great devotion and godly thankfulness. Spener [2] is clearer; he recognises that this is not a matter of a Divine command, "yet I feel that the sense of fellowship with our Christian brethren, who are receiving communion, should at the least move us to pray for them that they may receive aright. . . . I think also that to be present during the communion is very helpful for our own devotion . . . above all in order that each time we may the more powerfully represent to our minds our Saviour's Passion and death, in remembrance of which this sacrament was instituted, and so, together with the communicants, proclaim our Lord's death."

Here is a clear expression, from a Lutheran source, of the Memorial-idea. The fact that this objective view of the eucharistic action was all but lost to Lutheran Germany, and only emerged in a few isolated instances, may go far to account for the decline of the eucharist in that country, which we shall consider in the next section. Those who labour for the restoration of the eucharist to its true place in the life of the church need to keep the Memorial-aspect steadily in view.

Mystery.

We have dwelt so fully on the importance of the element of Mystery as the central characteristic of the Lutheran eucharistic type that no more than a brief summary is now required. We are finding throughout our study that the witness of liturgy and church life is no less important than that of doctrine, and in this case it is more significant. Here we have the fact that the Lutheran rites preserved on the whole the order of the ancient mass, with an instinctive sense that its dignity and solemnity were a safeguard of the reverence due to the holy. Preface and *Sanctus*, and even the metrical *Sanctus* of the type that followed the *Deutsche Messe*; vestments and incense, where these were retained; the kneeling communion and the careful preparation; all in various ways told the same tale.

We have seen how Luther's own teaching was shaped by his sense of the mystery of the sacrament. We noted the mystical communion-fellowship in his early writings. Next came his Testament-idea; but here it must be admitted that Mystery is less in evidence, unless it be right to see here the thought of the personal coming of the Saviour to bestow the forgiveness of sins. In this case we have here a somewhat attenuated form of the Synoptic mystery-type. But his conflict with Carlstadt and Zwingli had for its chief purpose the vindication of the element of Mystery. The literal sense of the words of institution is the basis of his argument; and the result of his mystical leanings, together with the centrality of the Incarnation in his mind, is that his thought takes a Johannine form; for though he refused to recognise the sacramental reference of the great eucharistic chapter of the Fourth Gospel, Johannine ideas had reached him indirectly through the Fathers, and through the nourishment which his spiritual life in general found in this Gospel.

---

[1] Justus Gesenius, 1601–73.

[2] Philipp Jakob Spener, 1635–1705. For the quotation see Graff, p. 178.

This accumulation in Luther's mind of a variety of unharmonised conceptions was not altogether an advantage; and the old-Lutheran view of the eucharistic mystery suffered from a number of defects. First among these we must reckon the fact that Luther's central religious idea, the forgiveness of sins, coloured the conception of the eucharist too completely. We have seen how the origins of this point of view lie far back in the history of the Latin church, and Lutheranism was only following mediæval usage in making penance obligatory before communion; but it so stressed this requirement as to make the peril of unworthy communion absolutely terrifying. A second confession and absolution were usually added after the sermon in the "offene Schuld"; and finally the special gift of communion itself was interpreted as the forgiveness of sins. This one-sided emphasis was only intensified by the fact that Luther himself used the term "forgiveness of sins" in a broad sense, to cover the whole fact of God's gracious coming to man; [1] and the common use of the term in the narrower sense resulted in the serious impoverishment of the idea of the sacrament in the Lutheran churches. The further result followed, that all but exclusive emphasis was laid on the individual aspect of communion; this individualism drove out of the Lutheran service the notes of thanksgiving and communion-fellowship; and the tendency in this direction can only have been strengthened by the influence of the Johannine mystery-type.

---

[1] See p. 102 f., above.

On the other hand, the communion of the individual soul with the Lord received in Lutheranism an intensely spiritual expression. Johannine and patristic influence helped Melanchthon to see in communion the incorporation of the Christian into Christ, " so that we are in Christ and Christ in us "—this *nos in Christo et Christus in nobis* is for all time the classical phrase for the communion of the soul with the Lord. It is here that the Lutheran communion hymns are at their very best and highest. The contemplation of sin and the Passion is relieved from time to time by the thought of the Heavenly Bridegroom, of the Bread of Life, and of the coming of Christ to dwell in the soul; and in the richest of them all, Franck's " Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele," [1] we meet again the mystical imagery taken from the Song of Songs.

But the most serious defect of the Lutheran interpretation of the eucharistic mystery is the localisation of the presence in the elements; for in affirming the reality of Christ's presence in the sacrament Luther was unable to escape from the mediæval statement of the problem. It is true that the presence was usually interpreted in a spiritual rather than a materialistic sense, just as Luther's doctrine of Ubiquity made a grossly corporeal view impossible. And whatever may have been the crudity of the phrases used, this doctrine of the presence in the elements did at least connect the sacrament with the Incarnation, and show the material basis of the spiritual gift; behind it is to be discerned the mysterious depth and richness of the Lutheran, or rather the Christian, conception of God. And again, the doctrine of *manducatio indignorum* [2] did at least guard the indispensable truth of the objectivity of the Divine presence in the sacrament. There was also much inconsistency in thought and in practice. On the one hand, in many places scrupulous care was taken over the remains of the sacred elements; on the other, the principle of *extra usum nullum sacramentum*, which was asserted by Luther, and still more definitely by his disciples, excluded the reservation of the sacrament, and gave rise to the specially Lutheran usage of a celebration in the sick-room.

But the old-Lutheran formulation of the real presence in the elements, never fully adequate to express the meaning which lay beneath it, became in course of time harder and more dogmatic; and in the traditional popular teaching all the emphasis has been laid on the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, the forgiveness of sins, and the words "for you." Perhaps Luther's *Lesser Catechism* is at its weakest at this point; it has presented to uneducated minds and inexperienced souls a difficult and unsuitable expression of the meaning of Holy Communion.

---

[1] The English Hymnal, No. 306.

[2] P. 110 above.

It is one of the most important tasks of systematic theology to find an expression in modern words and modern forms of thought for the spiritual realities which Luther desired to guard—if only it will condescend to stoop from its sublime heights to tackle such problems as these. Here indeed it has the whole problem of eucharistic theology to re-state, in a way which shall satisfy the demands both of the intellect and of spiritual experience. But Lutheran theologians will scarcely undertake this task with success till they have learnt to take into account the experience of other Christian communions.

4. The Lutheran Rite in Modern Germany.

It does not fall within the scope of this work to give anything like a history of the eucharist in Lutheran Germany; our aim is rather to fix the special characteristics of the Lutheran type. But this cannot be done satisfactorily without some consideration of the Scandinavian churches, in which the Lutheran spirit was able to develop more freely; for the fact that Luther was a German does not necessarily mean that Germany alone must for all time provide the norm and standard of Lutheranism. It is, however, necessary at this point to give some account of the place of the Lutheran rite in modern Germany, and the attacks which have been made upon it.

In his valuable study of the slow disintegration of the old-Lutheran type of service in Germany, P. Graff states his view thus: "The Lutheran rite is no more than the ruins of a liturgy. That which remained after the mutilation of the Roman mass was not a tree capable of growth, but a broken torso. The story of the Lutheran rite is the story of its disintegration."[1] The fact that the writer can pronounce this judgment without taking into account any other facts than those of German church history is in its way very typical; and among wide circles in Germany such an estimate is taken as almost axiomatic. But it may well be questioned whether even the German history, when fairly judged, justifies this estimate.

---

[1] Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen*, p. 14 ff.

It is impossible to deny that the old-Lutheran type of eucharist suffered from obvious defects. As defects we must reckon its disintegrating individualism, the over-prominence of the penitential and of the didactic elements, the unsatisfactory statement of the real presence, besides the purely liturgical faults which we have noted already—but not at all the fact that it preserved the broad lines of the Catholic scheme. When, however, we take into account the external difficulties with which the Lutheran churches had to contend during the Reformation period and the subsequent wars of religion; the political divisions of the nation, and the consequent dissection of Lutheranism into a multitude of small churches, which fatally obscured the idea of the visible church; the desolation of war, which hindered the development of a religious culture—when all this is taken into account, it may well appear that the evidence which Graff brings, so far from supporting his own thesis, really testifies to the remarkable vitality of the old-Lutheran type. In spite of all internal defects and external difficulties, it trained up a deep and spiritual religion, and it inspired a hymnody and a church music which have rarely been excelled.

Pietism began and the Enlightenment completed the disintegration of the old-Lutheran type; and the influence of the Reformed tradition acted as their ally.[1] The old Lutheran type failed, not by reason of its own defects, but because its doctrinal basis was dissolved away. The supremacy of the pulpit over the altar was a feature also of Lutheran orthodoxy; but there came with the eighteenth century a subjectivism which despised historical and institutional religion, and a Neology whose fastidious taste was intolerant of all ancient forms of liturgy. Thus what was spared by the demand of Pietism for " edification " was destroyed by the professorial blue-pencil of intellectualism.

A typical instance of the process of disintegration may be seen in the power which the consistory of Hanover granted to the minister to make additions and omissions in the liturgy, particularly to serve the needs of educated congregations, and " with prudence to adapt the prescribed forms *ad præsentes causas*." Kliefoth drew a gloomy picture of the state of affairs in the first half of the nineteenth century. The early part of the liturgy, up to the sermon, had shrunk to the introit hymn, salutation, collect, epistle, and the hymn before the sermon, so that the active share of the congregation in the service was reduced to the singing of hymns. The *missa fidelium* had lost the Preface and all that went with it; but this part of the service had on the whole fared better, and it was still common, at least in the country, for the eucharist to be celebrated at the chief Sunday service, though it was no longer the rule for it to be celebrated weekly. But when Kliefoth wrote, the liturgical revival had already begun, of which Löhe and he were the leaders.

---

[1] A study of the eucharistic usage of the various branches of Pietism would be of much interest. John Wesley visited Germany in 1737-8, and gives in his *Journal* a detailed account of the Moravian Settlement at Herrnhut, besides his impressions of the Lutheran church —*John Wesley's Journal* (Dent's Everyman edition), Vol. I. pp. 105–55.

The first important move towards a reform of the church service had been made in Frederick William III's *Prussian Agenda* of 1821, following on the formation by him of the Union Church of Prussia in 1817. It was the spirit of the old-Lutheran service that attracted the Hohenzollern prince, who belonged officially to the Reformed church; this may be taken as another sign of the vitality of the old-Lutheran type. This *Agenda*, defective as it was,[1] was followed by a series of others in different cities and states in the middle and later part of the century, among which we may mention the Bavarian *Agenda* of 1856 and 1879, which bear the stamp of Löhe's spirit. There is no need for us to describe in any detail the liturgical forms of these *Agenda*. They represent a revival of the Lutheran type of service in its richer form; if they show little creative originality, they are far from being mere copies of the older rites, and they arrange the traditional material in an intelligent way. We may note that the Preface reappears, with variable forms, and that the *Sanctus* follows it in the right order; and also that the eucharist is ordered to be celebrated at the chief Sunday service. The revised forms came widely, but not universally, into use; in some quarters they met with much opposition.

It is possible to get an idea of the actual state of church life at the beginning of this century from the valuable series of *Evangelische Kirchenkunde*[2] edited by P. Drews. The general impression given by these volumes is that the Lutheran type was still dominant, while at the same time certain features of the Reformed tradition were widely prevalent; in particular, the limitation of the celebration of the eucharist to a few fixed days in the year,[3] a tendency to give up the typically Lutheran custom of kneeling for communion, and the celebration of the eucharist separately from the chief service, generally in the evening, but sometimes in the early morning. This latter tendency is partly motived by practical considerations, such as the length o the service; but it is important to see that it is also a result of the individualistic idea of communion, and of failure to appreciate the Memorial-aspect of the service. As we shall see, it has been advocated more recently by theologians as a matter of principle.

---

[1] As, for instance, in the use of the Preface and *Sanctus* even when there was no communion.

[2] The churches of Saxony, Silesia, Baden, Thuringia, and Bavaria are dealt with in separate volumes.

[3] Especially in the country, where in some parts it might be celebrated once or twice a year (Thuringia). But in larger town churches in Silesia there was a weekly celebration.

It is clear, then, that the Lutheran type of service is far from having been wholly lost. On the other hand, the actual place of the sacrament in the life of the church has radically changed through the very serious decline in the numbers of communicants. It is indeed not without reason that the phrase *Abendmahlsnot*, "the sacramental crisis," has passed from mouth to mouth. But the decline of communion is by no means a new thing. In Saxony it is reckoned that about 1700 the proportion of communions to population was as high as 250–275 per cent.; in 1800, 150–175 per cent.; in 1830, 102 per cent.; in 1890, 48 per cent.; in 1896–1900, 43 per cent.; but here the figures for different congregations varied from 20 to 150 per cent. In 1918 the percentage for the whole of Saxony was 22; but this was an exceptionally low figure, due to war conditions, and in 1923 it had risen to 25 per cent. Such figures give only a rough guide; they would be more helpful if it were possible to judge the proportion of communions to communicants, and of communicants to church-goers. It would appear that the number of church-goers has not declined in anything like the same proportion, and that in individual cases a decrease of communions is coupled with an increased church attendance.

This highly disquieting state of affairs has called forth a variety of analyses of the situation and proposals for reform. Among these we must first notice Martin Kähler's doctrinal study of the sacraments,[1] which lays especial weight on their character as symbols of fellowship, and their connection with the historical church; and this is an important positive contribution. But on the practical side Kähler contents himself with criticism, comparing the common method of giving communion to the distribution of medicine, and calling—surely with some inconsistency—for less solemnity in the manner of celebration.

---

[1] *Die Sacramente als Gnadenmittel* (1903).

The practical proposals of the movement associated with the names of Spitta and Smend have resulted in praiseworthy efforts to secure greater beauty and dignity in the church building and the church service. Starting from his theory that the earliest eucharist was a glad feast in anticipation of the Messianic banquet,[1] Spitta wished to reconstruct the celebration as a common meal, after the pattern of the *Didache*, with no place for the element of Mystery, the communion being received sitting, and with hand-shaking as a further sign of fellowship. The communion-service was to be separated from the chief service, and there were to be individual communion cups. The author of this scheme was serenely convinced that it was possible for him, sitting at his desk, to create out of his own personal interpretation of the primitive rite a better order of service than that which has grown up in the church through the centuries. This attitude of mind is common to many of the modern German proposals for liturgical reform; but it is deeply in conflict with the nature of liturgy itself. For liturgy is indeed patiently tolerant of pruning and revision, and it is willing to allow expression to new ideas which well forth out of the depths of the religious consciousness; but it always firmly refuses to become the slave of the theological fashion of the day. Spitta's proposal is Reformed rather than Lutheran in character, but in religious depth it is immeasurably inferior to most of the newer Reformed rites which we shall study in the next chapter.

Smend's proposal is even more un-Lutheran than that of Spitta. In his two books [2] he shows a marked preference for the Zwinglian type over the Lutheran; he insists on the importance of the aspects of thanksgiving and fellowship, criticising with justice the Lutheran exaggeration of the penitential element, its terrifying emphasis on the peril of unworthy communion, and its one-sided individualism. He has also a laudable desire to preserve the rich variety to which the New Testament evidence bears witness. But he fails altogether to see that the Lutheran type, with all its one-sided emphasis on the element of Mystery, expresses infinitely important values, which need to be supplemented indeed, but not supplanted by the elements of eucharist and fellowship. Consequently his proposal amounts to no more than the substitution of the Reformed type for the

---

[1] See pp. 3 f., 14, above.

[2] *Der evangelische Gottesdienst*, 1903, and *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zur Luthers Deutscher Messe.*

Lutheran, and his practical ideal is the usage of the Dutch Reformed Church, which has always followed the lines of à Lasco's rite, in which the communicants take their places round the table.[1]

Smend takes for granted, in direct opposition to the fundamental idea of the old-Lutheran type, that the eucharist is to be separated from the chief service; and this demand has come to be regarded in wide circles in Germany as self-evidently necessary.[2] Von Zezschwitz maintains as a matter of principle the primacy of the preaching-service. And the theoretical demand has been reinforced by those who have sought to find a practical remedy for the prevailing *Abendmahlsnot*;[3] thus theologians and practically-minded churchmen have united to pronounce the final sentence of death on the old-Lutheran type of service.

The problem of the *Abendmahlsnot* is very complicated. But it cannot be maintained that the primary cause of the decline of communion is the liturgical defectiveness of the traditional rite. The reason is rather to be found in the uncertainty of theologians about eucharistic doctrine, and the impoverished outlook of neo-protestant rationalism; for the various schools which have succeeded one another at the German seats of learning have been at one in their incapacity to appreciate the mystical side of religion—with the exception, perhaps, of the most recent phase. And rather than consider whether the old-Lutheran type of service could be purged of its defects and reconstructed, men were all too ready to condemn it outright. This readiness was all of a piece with failure to perceive the importance of the Memorial-aspect of the liturgy, and its visual, dramatic side in general, and with a one-sided emphasis on communion. But in spite of all that was said about the importance of the aspect of fellowship, the real danger was, and is, a more exclusive emphasis on communion as a gift to the individual than when the eucharist was part of the chief Sunday service.

The matter at issue is far greater than the mere question whether sermon and sacrament are to form part of the same service. The question is whether the eucharist is to recover its central place in the worship of the church, or lose that position altogether and be relegated to a place in which it will no longer be an offence to the majority of church-goers; it will then become the preserve of the religiously-minded, and may well be prettily decked out in the language of subjective religious experience. It is the question whether the Lutheran type is to be wholly superseded by a Reformed type *minus* all that is sound and strong in the Reformed tradition.

---

[1] See p. 184 f. below.

[2] So Rietschel (*Liturgik*, I. 508), and even Kliefoth, *Theorie des Kultus der evan. Kirche*, p. 203; and Achelis, Niebergall, Schian.

[3] Baumgarten, *Die Abendmahlsnot*; Bassermann, *Ueber Reform des Abendmahls* (1904).

Yet the Lutheran type still retains its place in the formularies of the various *Agenda*, and signs are not lacking that the lively interest which liturgical study has aroused in the last ten years may lead to its revival even in Germany. It is true that the absence of a single, fixed liturgical tradition, such as is found in Sweden or Denmark, has a bad effect; and many of the recent proposals show a spirit of irresponsibility and a readiness to embark on novel experiments, which are never found in truly creative liturgical work. This fault is especially characteristic of the school of R. Otto.[1] Otto's acute analysis of the irrational element in religious experience has indeed encouraged a more serious estimate of liturgical problems; but he quite fails to see that a glorified subjectivism can never create the sense of the *tremendum* and the *fascinosum*—nothing can, except the objectively real. But what else than subjectivism is presupposed by "der schweigende Dienst," however much the holy silence which forms the centre of the service is arrayed in elements such as the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, obtained by plundering the eucharistic liturgy? The eucharist has for him only a secondary significance; and his proposed liturgy consists of a medley of ancient traditional forms and highly injudicious additions of his own. It includes the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, salutation, collect, and a lesson; later on, solemn offertory ceremonial and a salutation; in the central part of the service the Preface and *Sanctus* are followed by an exhortation; the words of institution are said or sung by the celebrant and people together, and are followed by silence, and then extempore prayer. The communicants receive standing in the pews. It can only be said that the exhortation forms a flat anticlimax after the *Sanctus*, and the silence takes so central a place that this service would seem to be regarded as a special form of "der schweigende Dienst"; while extempore prayer is altogether out of place at the centre of the eucharistic act.

But the newer high-church school is making a very interesting attempt to return to traditional forms. It is true that the spirit of irresponsible experiment is all too evident; formulæ taken from the *Agenda* are decked out with a variety of ornamentation, in which mere æstheticism is all too prominent; the reaction against the neglect of the sacrament leads to an overvaluing of forms for their own sake; and there seems to be a tendency to an uncritical acceptance of purely Roman (as distinct from Catholic) formulæ and doctrines. If the high-church movement can escape from this tendency, and can grow out of the sectarian isolation which seems to threaten it into a fuller realisation of the Catholic heritage of genuine Lutheranism, it will certainly have an important mission to fulfil.

---

[1] Otto, *Zu Erneuerung und Ausgestaltung des Gottesdienstes* (1923).

There is nothing un-Lutheran in the demand made by this movement for a lessened emphasis on the sermon. The situation has altered since the sixteenth century; there is little danger to-day of any tyranny of the altar over the pulpit, but rather the opposite; and a reaction against the domination of the didactic element is urgently called for. Assuredly Luther never intended that the sermon should dominate the service at the expense of the sacrament. To bring back the sacrament, both as Act of Memorial and as communion, to be the central act of worship, is to bring in again the old-Lutheran type. Nor does this involve a slavish reproduction of the sixteenth-century formulæ. The problem of the present day is to develop the possibilities of this type of service in the light of the gathered experience of the church, and of the liturgical knowledge which Luther did not possess.

Certain recent proposals show that there is every ground for hoping that such a liturgical revival may be the fruit of the still young high-church movement. O. J. Mehl has published an interesting liturgical scheme, showing a praiseworthy freedom from ritualistic extravagances.[1] It presupposes the restoration of the eucharist as the chief service, at least in large churches, and that, not only as the communion but also as the Act of Memorial; and it is clothed in dignified but not over-elaborate forms. Certain points are much open to criticism; but as a whole this work may well be a sign of a rediscovery of the value of the eucharistic tradition, with a juster estimate of the various aspects of the rite. Only a deep insight into the life of the universal church, of the past and of the present, can show the way of escape for the church in Germany from the state of chaos into which it has been plunged by well-intentioned but misguided efforts for reform.

---

[1] *Vom Bau und Ausbau der Liturgie* (1925). That the need for a recovery of sacramental worship is felt also outside the small high-church section is evident from such a moderate work as W. Heienbrok's *Evangelische Kirchenkunde* (1929), where also the outline of a communion-service on the classical lines is given; although in other respects it contains statements open to criticism from the point of view of this book.

CHAPTER V

THE REFORMED TRADITION

1. Zwingli's Eucharistic Doctrine.

THE common Lutheran estimate of Zwingli's eucharistic teaching has suffered in some degree from the same weakness as Luther's own estimate. Luther first heard of him, in 1524, as one whose sacramental belief differed from his own, and the man had soon been summed up in a slogan: "Zwingli and Leo Judae in Switzerland hold the same view as Carlstadt, and maintain stubbornly that in the sacrament there is only common bread, such as is sold in the market." [1] We have seen how it was in controversy with Zwingli that Luther's doctrine of the real presence in the elements was shaped.

Similarly, Lutheran theologians have always chiefly emphasised the negative side of Zwingli. This appears even in a modern writer such as Seeberg,[2] who shows how Zwingli developed the symbolism which was one side of Augustine's teaching, and was also dependent on Erasmus; any close study of Zwingli's sacramental ideas ought to start from the humanistic "reformists," the contemporaries and disciples of the great scholar.[3] This symbolism is above all expressed in Zwingli's interpretation of the words of institution, that *est* means *significat;* and so it is only to the contemplation of faith that Christ's body and blood can be said to be present, and the eating of his flesh is only a manner of describing faith in him. The celebration of the eucharist can then be no more than an act whereby Christians make commemoration of their salvation through Christ's death, and pledge themselves to his service.

This view has recently been challenged by Doumergue and others as a misrepresentation of Zwingli's real position.[4]

---

[1] W. Köhler, "Luther und Zwingli," in *Zeitschr. für Theologie und Kirche*, 1925, p. 461.

[2] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, VI. i. p. 371 ff.

[3] Zwingli's dependence on Erasmus is also emphasised by W. Köhler in his great book *Zwingli und Luther*, I. 49 ff.

[4] See Barclay, *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Glasgow, 1927) p. 42.

It is urged that the *De canone missæ epicheiresis* contains expressions which go far beyond a merely symbolistic view; the prayers occurring in that eucharistic rite speak of Christ as giving himself to be the food of the faithful; [1] and again, that at the Marburg Conference Zwingli was prepared to recognise a spiritual presence in the elements, while Luther insisted on a corporeal presence; [2] and finally, that in the earlier period the standpoint of Luther and Zwingli was identical, in that both repudiated the sacrifice of the mass, and emphasised the necessity of faith in the word of the Testament.

Clearly this question is important to our inquiry; clearly also it is impossible to undertake here a comprehensive and detailed examination of the evidence. It is only possible for us here to endeavour to characterise the difference between Luther and Zwingli, and to do justice to the positive as well as to the negative side of Zwingli's attitude.

It is not necessary to give illustrations to show how Zwingli, like Luther, began by attacking the sacrifice of the mass. In the exposition of the 18th Article in *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden* (1523) Zwingli refers explicitly to Luther's statement of the Testament-idea, and agrees with it. There is here no difference between them. But when Zwingli is already found to be laying stress on the commemorative aspect of the eucharist, and insisting that the body and blood of Christ are nothing but " the word of faith," and that if we believe the word about the sacrificial death of Christ, " then our souls are nourished with the food and drink of the body and blood of Christ," [3] the difference begins to emerge, even if we only were to regard Luther's anti-Roman writings. It comes out more clearly when we remember that Luther's earliest writings on the eucharist had been homiletic in character, while Zwingli the humanist began with polemics. It becomes fully evident in Zwingli's *Ad Matthæum Alberum de cœna dominica epistola* (1524), and especially in the *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* (1525). Already in the *Schlussreden*, though not yet prepared to exclude a deeper interpretation, he describes the Lord's Supper as an act of commemoration and communion.

The relevant part of the *Commentarius* begins with an explanation of the word *sacramentum*. It is unfortunate, he thinks, that this word is a foreign word adopted into German; the result is that it suggests "aliquid magnum sanctumque," something which by its inherent power can set a man free from sin. A learned dissertation follows on its original meaning: it is a pledge which in certain legal disputes was laid at the altar; it is also an oath, especially *sacramentum militare*. He cannot find in his authorities that it was used in any holy or mysterious sense, nor yet that it was synonymous with the Greek word "mystery"—though he quotes the Vulgate rendering of Ephes. v. 32 (*sacramentum hoc magnum est*) he dismisses it as an unsatisfactory translation—but just at this decisive point the humanist fails in philological insight.[1] Therefore, for the meaning of "sacrament" we are left with just this, that it is either a dedication or a pledge whereby something else is symbolised. But the analysis gains its end all the better for the largely negative character of the result; for the object is, to strip off from the sacred action its mysterious, "numinous" character. If Zwingli's teaching in this treatise appears very advanced and definite, when compared with the exposition of the 18th Article in the *Schlussreden*, this should not be put down to any real change of opinion. The time had not then been ripe for such a drastic rearrangement of the service as the more radical view demanded.

---

[1] See below, p. 159 f.

[2] Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, V. p. 353. Cf. also Anderson Scott, art. " Zwingli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," in *The Expositor*, 1901.

[3] Zwingli's works, II. 143.

The *Letter to Alber* starts with a detailed exegesis of John vi.,[2] and the conclusions which he reaches here dominate his later writings. He agrees with Luther in finding no direct reference to the eucharist in this chapter. But while Luther consequently leaves it out of his discussion, Zwingli takes as the corner-stone of his eucharistic doctrine John vi. 63, "the flesh profiteth nothing"—not consistently, for, as Goetz[3] points out, if the passage as a whole has nothing to do with the eucharist, then ver. 63 cannot be taken as referring to it. As then in this passage the eating of the bread of life means only the spiritual apprehension of the word, so it must be also with the words of institution; *is* can only mean *signifies*.[4] "The bread of which Christ speaks is this, that Christ was for our sake offered up to death"; and again, "the food . . . is faith"; to eat is to believe. Thus the real and essential meaning of the eucharist is that it is a commemoration, and this connects with the Pauline saying about "proclaiming the Lord's death." Not without a certain self-satisfaction at his dialectical statement of the subject, Zwingli speaks contemptuously of the childish ideas of a corporeal eating, such as might find acceptance among cannibals.[1] But neither at this period, nor in his later controversy with Luther, has he the least idea that deep religious values might lie beneath the clumsy formulæ.

---

[1] III. 756 ff.

[2] III. 341.

[3] *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage* (2nd ed.), p 65 f.

[4] III. 338.

It would seem then to be indisputable that his teaching on this point is symbolistic, and indeed in an almost defiant way purely symbolistic; to support his view he collects an imposing array of patristic quotations. He denies also that the eucharist can be properly called a means of grace; it is "false religion" to believe that the eating of bread can blot out sins.[2]

But the deepest significance of Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine is that it expresses his idea of the relation between spirit and matter, and ultimately between God and the world. Faith can only be directed to a spiritual object of faith; faith is hope for and trust in things which are as far as possible removed from this visible world. Therefore it is logically quite impossible to connect with faith anything so material as a bodily act of eating. "If you believe that you eat, then that which you eat cannot be either visible or corporeal."[3] The same idea recurs in the "alloiosis-doctrine"; it is only a rhetorical figure, when that is said of one of the two natures of Christ which belongs rightly to the other. Jesus cannot be speaking of sacramental eating in John vi. "Only because he was slain for us can he be our Saviour; but only according to the flesh could he be slain, and only in virtue of his Divine nature can he be our Saviour. Only in this sense then can Christ be the food of the soul, that when the soul sees how God spared not his only-begotten Son, but gave Him up to a shameful death to restore us to life, it becomes aware of God, of grace, and of salvation." When it is said that the body of Christ was offered for the world's salvation, the expression refers to the whole Christ, but it can sometimes be used of one only of his two natures.[4]

Thus the contrast of Zwingli's view with Luther's ultimately means, not that a purer and more spiritual conception of Christianity has prevailed over a cruder mode of thought, fast bound in mediæval superstition; but rather, it is a conflict between two religious temperaments, which correspond to two different conceptions of God. The crude transcendence in Zwingli's idea of God, leading to the local conception of heaven, about which Luther is so sarcastic,[1] ultimately excludes any real communion between the spiritual and the material. Therefore also the Incarnation can have no meaning in itself. The whole significance of Christ's human nature consists in this, that it could be offered on the cross; and the apprehension by faith of this historical fact is the whole meaning that can be found in the reception of Christ's body. This point was made quite clear also in the more eirenic *Amica exegesis* of 1529, which was written under the influence of the theologians of Strassburg, to prepare the way for an understanding with Luther.[2] There was no room in this chilly rationalistic religion for the mystical communion between God and man, which lies at the root of sacramental religion. It was ultimately Zwingli's idea of God, which left no place in his eucharistic doctrine for the element of Mystery.

---

[1] III. 788 f. [2] III. 801. [3] III. 786. [4] III. 779.

But this does not mean that it can be dismissed as valueless. It is as important to observe its positive merits as to see its limitations. The neglect of the aspect of Mystery gave increased scope to those of Thanksgiving and of Fellowship; at least the latter of these kindles in Zwingli some real warmth of feeling. It is through Communion-fellowship that the name Eucharist can be justified; it is the Greek name, and Zwingli always regarded the Greeks as " more devout and more learned " than the Latins. The aspect of the service as a Memorial meant even less for him than for Luther; he had no idea at all of the whole service as an offering of thanksgiving, a joyful sacrifice of praise. The Thanksgiving consists in the act of fellowship; " he who partakes in this public giving of thanks declares in the presence of the whole church that he belongs to the number of those who trust in the death of Christ for us." [3] It is also an act of confession, not so much of sin and unworthiness, as of glad anticipation of a share in salvation. Here is seen the subjectivist character of the whole conception. The act is primarily the act of the congregation confessing its faith; this takes the central place which in Lutheranism is taken by the reception of God's objective gift. If he exaggerates the difference, Kliefoth [4] is nevertheless right in seeing here the deepest difference between the Reformed and the Lutheran type of service.

At the same time the sense of Communion-fellowship recovers with Zwingli something of its primitive intensity. The Pauline saying, that the faithful are one bread and the body of Christ can here gain and keep the central place which it lost for Luther. Paul teaches that " they who here eat and drink are one body, one bread; that is, all those who come together to proclaim Christ's death and eat the symbolical bread, declare themselves to be Christ's body, that is, members of his church; and as this church holds one faith and eats one symbolical bread, so it is one bread and one body." [1] Those who eat the bread and drink of the cup shall grow together with the rest of the brethren to be the body of Christ. But that which binds together the members of the body is not the sacrament, but their faith. " What does the eating then mean? Just this, that you proclaim before your brethren that you are a member of Christ, one of those who trust in Christ; and further, it pledges you to a Christian life, so that if you do not renounce your sinful ways, you are cut off from the other members." [2] Thus the way is opened to include the idea of personal self-oblation, but this thought does not with Zwingli take a central place. The thought of fellowship bears especially the mark of glad thanksgiving; Zwingli thinks that he sees in the Acts of the Apostles the type of congregational meal which he himself has in view. At the glad eucharistic service there should be no preaching about the Passion of Christ, for the service is a " panegyrus," a " collaudatio." At the same time, the work of the cross remains the subject of the thanksgiving: " Tenemus nunc ipso nomine quid eucharistia, *i.e.* cœna dominica, sit, nempe gratiarum actio et communis gratulatio eorum qui mortem Domini annuntiant, hoc est, ebuccinant, laudant, confitentur et unice exaltant." [3]

---

[1] Cf. p. 105 above.

[2] Köhler, I. 818 f.

[3] III. 775.

[4] *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, VII. p. 86 f.

Thus the special character of the Reformed type is already in Zwingli theoretically worked out. Of the broken vision of the Eucharist in evangelical Christendom, it is the aspect of Communion-fellowship which has been specially entrusted to the Reformed churches to guard. It was the tragedy of Luther that, though in his earlier eucharistic writings he had expressed the thought of Communion-fellowship in a deeper and more spiritual form than Zwingli ever reached, he failed to develop it later and lift it to the highest levels of his sacramental experience. The Zwinglian view has no bold crags; everything is tidy and rationally ordered. But the idea of Fellowship stands on its highest point.

---

[1] III. 802.

[2] III. 349.

[3] Köhler, I. p. 839, where the positive side of the Zwinglian conception is well brought out.

2. The Zürich Rite.

Zwingli's first liturgical work, the *De canone missæ epicheiresis* of 1523, is thoroughly typical of the humanist, both in the faultless elegance of its diction, and still more in its criticism of the barbarisms of the Latin canon of the mass. The author's object is to prove that on the ground of its unclassical style the canon cannot possess the high antiquity claimed for it. At times he makes acute comments on its contradictory phrases. A religious interest is, however, already discernible behind the haughty criticisms of the schoolmaster, in his opposition to the idea of sacrifice in the mass.

But it is the conservative character of Zwingli's liturgical proposals that is the most interesting feature of this work. The use of vestments is permitted, and nearly the whole of the early part of the old mass is retained, with the exception that the Saints' day collects and the proses and sequences disappear, and also the offertory; the musical setting is remorselessly cut down; the lections are read in German, with a short exposition, if desired. The Nicene Creed is followed by the Preface and *Sanctus*. The canon, however, is not simply omitted, as in the Lutheran rites, but is replaced by a series of four Latin prayers, of real interest, if somewhat didactic in tone. Zwingli had originally intended "for the sake of the weaker brethren" to follow the canon closely throughout, but he found the order of its sections as intractable as their contents.

The first of the four prayers [1] recapitulates the story of redemption, in a manner reminiscent of the Greek anaphora, and ends with the Lord's Prayer; the second beseeches God that he will feed the hungry with the bread of heaven —but here Zwingli's theology comes in; and though other expressions in the *Epicheiresis* speak in the old way of Christ's body and blood, it is plainly stated that it is the "word" that is the true heavenly bread. The third prayer starts with the sacrifice of Christ, on the ground of which "he offered himself to be the food of our souls under the forms of bread and wine," and goes on to speak of the imitation of Christ and of Christian fellowship. "For it was for this purpose that he gave himself to be our food, that as he overcame the world, so we, feeding on him, might have good courage to overcome the world. . . . Grant us therefore, O merciful Father, through Christ thy Son our Lord,

[1] Zwingli's works, II. 605 ff. Also in Smend, *Deutsche Messen*, p. 192 ff.

through whom thou dost give life to all and renew and sustain all in being, that in our lives we may show him forth. that the likeness which was in Adam lost may be renewed in us. And that this may the more surely and effectively take place in us, grant that all we who shall be partakers of thy Son's body and blood may have one spirit and one aim, and ourselves be one in him, who is one with thee." The fourth prayer asks that the communicants may be led, by the light of grace, to partake worthily in "thy Son's banquet, wherein he himself is both our host and our food"; it leads to the words of institution, which are followed by the Pauline verse about proclaiming the Lord's death, and "Come unto me all ye that travail." After the communion follows the *Nunc Dimittis* and a post-communion.

This order, which is to be compared with the *Formula Missæ*, and in many respects excels it in liturgical fitness, contains suggestive points which are worth consideration even to-day. But it is probable that its conservatism was the result less of Zwingli's moderation than of the circumstances of the time; the Council at Zürich were not yet ready for drastic changes. Already the little treatise in defence of the *Epicheiresis* [1] goes further, denounces vestments, and criticises severely the traditional mass-music. It is clear that this Latin order of service was thought of as merely a provisional stage.

In April 1525 Zwingli's *Action oder Bruch des Nachtmals* [2] was printed; this was his first attempt at an independent expression of the new doctrines in a liturgical form. Whatever we may think of Zwingli's ideas, we must admit that this is one of the most remarkable documents in the liturgical history of Protestantism.

The rite itself is preceded by a twofold introduction. The ministers of the word at Zürich send a greeting to all the faithful in Christ. For a long time past error had reigned; but now God in his mercy had shown the right way. No binding rules are laid down about ceremonies; each church might please itself. The communion itself was a ceremony, which Christ ordained. At Zürich they had retained as little as possible of the outward trappings; but they did not condemn the singing and similar practices which other churches had kept. The communion being what it was, the church had the right to exclude from it open sinners, who defile Christ's body. The second preface gives directions for the service. Significantly enough, the initial letter in the original edition contains a miniature of Christ driving out those that bought and sold in the temple. Four times in the year the communion is to be celebrated: at Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, and once in the autumn. The Easter communion may be divided up among several celebrations. The communicants are to take their places round about the choir, and receive the bread and wine sitting; after the reading of the words of institution, the deacons are to take round the unleavened bread on wooden platters. Three such deacons or ministers are presupposed in the ritual, besides the celebrant.

---

[1] II. 620 f.

[2] Smend, p. 194 ff: also in Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, III. 147–57.

A sermon having been delivered, the table is prepared, and the service begins with (1) a prayer for grace to accomplish rightly the "praise and thanksgiving which thy only Son our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ commanded us, the faithful, to make in memory of his death." (2) The reading by a minister of 1 Cor. xi. 20–29. (3) *Gloria in excelsis*, recited antiphonally by the celebrant and people—singing being altogether banned at Zürich. (4) The reading of John vi. 47–63. It is very remarkable that this passage, which according to Zwingli has nothing to do with the sacrament, should have a place in the service; probably it was intended to be a continual reminder that in this rite there is no thought of a "sacrament" in the proper sense. (5) The Apostles' Creed, repeated antiphonally, by the men and women; and followed by (6) an exhortation by the deacon: "Now, dearly beloved, we will according to our Lord Jesus Christ's institution eat the bread and drink the drink, as he has commanded us to do, to remember with praise and thanksgiving that he has suffered death for us and shed his blood to wash away our sin. Then let each, according to Paul's word, call to mind what trust, faith and confidence he has in the same our Lord Jesus Christ; that so none may give himself out to be a believer who is not, and so become guilty of the Lord's death. Neither let anyone sin against the Christian congregation, which is Christ's body. Kneel, therefore, and pray: Our Father. . . ." (7) Prayer by the deacon, for a worthy communion, specially emphasising the acceptance of the obligation so to live as befits members of Christ's body. (8) Recital by the celebrant of the words of institution, followed by (9) the distribution. (10) Psalm 113 ("Praise the Lord, ye servants"), recited antiphonally by the men and women. (11) The celebrant (*der Hirt*): "We thank thee, O Lord, for all thy gifts and thy goodness, who livest and reignest, God for ever and ever." "Amen." "Go in peace."

If it be the purpose of liturgy to provide an expression in ritual of a thought-out dogmatic conception, the *Action oder Bruch* must be pronounced a liturgical masterpiece. Every detail helps to express the character of the action, as a social meal in remembrance of the great fact, upon which the unity of the congregation is based; not least the sitting communion, and the antiphonal recitation—even though this point proved impossible to realise in practice, and degenerated into a recitation between two ministrants, called "diakon" and "hypodiakon."[1] Strong moral earnestness is given to the rite by the emphasis on the obligation of the communicant to live a holy life; while at the same time the place of the service in the life of the congregation tends to make it a general muster or review of all church-members of good standing. The note of thanksgiving is repeatedly emphasised, above all in the post-communion psalm, though the total absence of music deprives the Zwinglian service of the chief of all expressions of gladness. The service as a whole may be summed up as a corporate act of praise and thanksgiving, performed by the congregation, and in no way a means of grace, except in so far as "the word" has a place in it. It is for this reason that no need was felt for frequent communion, and thus the practice of four celebrations in the year became one of the characteristics of the Reformed type.

One result of this logical expression in liturgy of the Zwinglian doctrine was that the communion service now came to be separated from the preaching-service; it is true that it was preceded by a sermon, but the regular ministry of the word had its own form, quite separate from the communion. The consequence was the impoverishment of both. In losing the eucharistic action, the regular Sunday service lost a focus and a devotional culmination, and was abandoned to the didactic tyranny of the spoken word; and the communion service lost its historical orientation. Zwingli's act of commemoration is a commemoration of one historical event only; therefore all other historical material is set aside, including most of the historical forms of the old mass. It is true that in comparison with the Calvinistic service, Zwingli's is relatively full; the *Gloria* remains, and there is a vague resemblance to the order of the old liturgy.[1] When we compare it with the other German rites then in existence, its radical character is apparent; the Preface and *Sanctus* have disappeared, and also the lections and the *de tempore* principle as a whole. This is the beginning of the abandonment of the liturgical year, which has been the main cause of the lack of variety in the Reformed service, and a monument of the anti-historical rationalism which watched over its cradle.

---

[1] Rietschel, *Liturgik*, I. p. 413 f.

At the same time the aspect of Fellowship loses a great part of its depth, by ceasing to be an act of solidarity with the life of the Church of all ages and generations, and coming to be limited to the present congregation. The aspect of Commemoration is central to Zwingli's thought, in the sense of an act of remembrance of Christ's death; but he missed as completely as Luther the Memorial-aspect of the eucharistic act itself, and the logical derivation of the Zwinglian rite from the Zwinglian doctrine effectively robbed the service of the character of a sacred drama, which the Lutheran rite with a most fortunate inconsistency preserved. On the other hand, the Zürich rite provided opportunity for the expression of the individual's self-oblation and acceptance of obligation, which Wittenberg failed to bring out.

But the deepest difference lies in the disappearance from the Zürich type of the element of Mystery. Doctrine and ritual are on this point completely in accord; it is only in the thought of Fellowship that a trace of mystical warmth can be discerned. But even here the act of communion is primarily only an outward testimony to the inward unity which has already been attained through faith. The common meal received sitting, which is the symbol of blameless membership in the congregation, can hardly surround itself with the holy awe, the consciousness of creatureliness, which is the necessary basis of Mystery; and it can hardly become the vehicle of a religion powerful enough to overcome the narrowness of intellectualism. In comparison with this loss it is a poor gain that the Zwinglian spirit does not dress itself in the mourning robes of Lutheran penitence, but comes to serve God with glad thankfulness.

Thus the main lines of the Reformed service already stand out quite clearly in the Zwinglian rite. The indirect influence of *Action oder Bruch* is difficult to determine; its direct influence was limited mainly to Zürich, Bern and Basel, and Zürich alone remained faithful to its classical liturgy, with the exception that singing was introduced before the end of the century.[1] Œcolampadius, who had already shown his liturgical talents in *Das Testament Jesu Christi*[2]—if indeed he is its author—produced his Basel-liturgy in 1525, which is one of the most attractive documents of the period. But it was Strassburg that was to be the sally-port through which the influence of the Swiss Reformation was to make itself felt in a wider world, when Calvin's genius had provided it with armour and equipment.

---

[1] Certainly exaggerated by Smend (p. 206). If Zwingli's service is rich in comparison with Calvin's, it is meagre when measured against the Lutheran rites which had already appeared.

3. Calvin's Eucharistic Doctrine.

It was Calvin's aim to act as mediator between the Swiss Reformers and Luther. The fact that in this respect he carried on the work of Bucer[3] is due to the fact that this had been his object from the beginning, rather than to any direct influence of Bucer upon him: for his views were already formed before his visit to Strassburg, and in any case Bucer's influence affected his ideas of church organisation more than of doctrine. For both men, Luther was the great pioneer, with whom Zwingli could not be compared in importance. On the other hand, the humanistic background which was common to them both formed a link between them and Zwingli; and this is of peculiar importance in the matter of the eucharist.

The problem was not the same for Calvin as for the men of the first generation. The great battle against the sacrifice of the mass and transubstantiation was now in principle won; and though Calvin exposed the untenableness of the common ideas of the sacrifice with greater clearness than his predecessors, and also with greater bitterness, yet this issue had for him only a secondary interest. His main problem was to relate himself to the two types of eucharistic practice which had already taken shape, and find such a middle way as might satisfy both the need for intellectual clearness and the religious interest. This may be illustrated from the first edition of the *Institutes* (1536), and from the *Petit Traicté de la Saincte Cène* (1541).[4] In the concluding part of the latter work he criticises both parties. The expressions which Luther used about the sacrament were such as to convey the impression that, in spite of his rejection of transubstantiation, in all essential points he stood on the old lines.[1] But Zwingli and Œcolampadius, in their zeal to repudiate the devilish deceits of the Roman teaching, had "omitted to show what sort of a presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist is to be believed, or what sort of communion of his body and blood is there received."[2] The controversy had been very bitter; Luther "with his accustomed vehemence" had used exaggerated expressions, and the other side had been driven to be more destructive than constructive in their reply.

---

[1] Smend, p. 211.
[2] P. 114 above.
[3] Seeberg, IV. 2. p. 555 f.
[4] Authorities for the following: Seeberg, IV. 2. 605 ff. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, V. pp. 534–76.

In his own general treatment of the sacraments he reveals his determination to do better justice to their religious values than Zwingli had done; this reflects without doubt a deeper religious experience. The sacraments are outward signs "whereby God sets forth and declares his goodwill towards us, to uphold the weakness of our faith";[3] and they are exercises wherein God uses material means to strengthen our faith in his word; "they lead us by the hand, as nurses lead children." When, in phrases taken from Luther, he speaks of them as seals, or marks the importance of the word of Christ, from which the sacraments derive their power, he is using terms common to all the reformers. But when he insists that they are Divine acts, and means of grace, he is consciously diverging from Zwingli; on Zwingli's criticism of the word "sacrament,"[4] he remarks that such a view puts man's action before God's.[5] Though the outward means are in themselves nothing, yet God uses them to feed the soul with spiritual food, just as he uses fire to warm us, and the sun to give us light.

He goes deeper than Zwingli, even in matters in which he stands nearer to him than to Luther. His treatment of the aspect of Thanksgiving is more austere. He agrees in treating as a special fruit of communion that it stirs us up to a deeper sense of the blessings which we daily receive from the Lord, so that we offer him the thanks and praise which are due to him; but it is above all in life that this praise is to be given, and so the thought of personal self-oblation comes in. The appreciation of this aspect of the eucharistic sacrifice is a special characteristic of the Calvinistic type. "It is right and fitting that we ourselves and all our work should be sanctified and dedicated to him, that all that is in us may minister to his praise and set forth his glory. This sort of oblation has nothing to do with the propitiation of God's wrath, or with obtaining the forgiveness of our sins; it consists simply in praising and exalting God." [1] By the united confession of the lips and of the life the memory of Christ's death is made; and so this aspect also is carried over from the sphere of doctrine to that of the will.

---

[1] "il adioustait des similitudes, lesquelles estoient un peu dures et rudes." *Corpus Reformatorum*, V. 458. *Calvini opera selecta*, I. 527.

[2] Calvin's works: *Corpus Reformatorum*, V. 458; *Calvini opera selecta*, I. 527.

[3] Institutes, IV. *Corp. R.*, I. 102; *Op. sel.*, I. 118.

[4] P. 155 above.

[5] *Institutes*, IV. *Corp. R.*, I. 106; *Op. sel.*, I. 122.

Again, the way in which Communion-fellowship appears in Calvin in a deepened form may be illustrated from a passage from the *Institutes*, which forms one of the noblest expressions in evangelical Christianity of the Pauline conception: "The Lord in such wise communicates to us his body, that he becomes one with us and we with him. And since he has but one body, in which he gives us all a part, it follows that we through this participation become one body. This unity is symbolised by the bread which is brought forth for the sacrament; as it is baked out of many small grains, so blended together that one cannot be separated from another, so likewise it happens to us, that we are united and bound together in such a unity of souls that no dissension or quarrel may divide us . . ." (here follows a reference to 1 Cor. x. 16 f.). "Verily we shall have gained a wonderful benefit from communion, if this thought is thereby impressed and engraved into our souls: that none of our brethren can be insulted, mocked, laughed at, despised, or in any way dishonoured, but that we at the same time insult, mock, laugh at and despise Christ; that we cannot separate ourselves from the brethren without separating ourselves from Christ; and that Christ cannot be loved by us unless we love him in the brethren. . . . As no part of our bodies can be subject to pain without the whole body being affected, so it cannot be endured that one brother should suffer evil and we not be moved to sympathy. Thus it is with reason that Augustine so often calls the sacrament the bond of love—*caritatis vinculum*. For what stronger incentive could have been used to awaken in us mutual love than that Christ, in giving himself for us, should not merely by his example move us to self-devotion for one another's sake, but should both give himself to be ours in common and make us to be one in himself?"[1] In the *Traicté* the same thoughts recur, and it is more clearly emphasised that the sacrament does not merely symbolise the unity which Christians already possess in their faith, but that the Lord "works within us through his Holy Spirit to fulfil his own command"; and since the Holy Spirit is joined with the sacraments, he who uses them aright can hope to find in them "a good means of grace and help, causing us to increase and go forward in holiness of life, and above all in love."[2]

---

[1] *Corp. R.*, I. 137; *Op. sel.*, I. 158.

The Memorial-aspect of the eucharist is pushed into the background by that of Communion in Calvin's teaching even more completely than in Zwingli's; and his desire to escape from the bare idea of an act in memory of the Lord's death makes him forget that the historical side also is an aspect that needs adequate expression. He can speak of the sacrament as a mirror, in which we behold Christ crucified; but the meaning of the Lord's death as an actual fact in history is altogether overshadowed by its eternal significance as the means of salvation, and the *æterna vivificatio* which is its fruit.[3] For a broader historical view he leaves no room either in his teaching or in the liturgy.

He emphasises, as we have seen, one side of the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice. For the rest, he starts (in the *Institutes*) with stating the alternative of atoning or eucharistic sacrifice; the atoning sacrifice can only be the one sacrifice of Calvary; therefore any repetition of it would derogate from the merits of Christ. And the violence of his dislike towards the ancient liturgical form of the mass makes it impossible for him to see in the service anything of the nature of "an acted sermon."

But the religious centre of Calvin's view is his grasp of the element of Mystery. Here he is consciously at issue with Zwingli; it is no mere form of words when he loves to speak of it as "ce sainct mystere." It is this that gives its depth to Calvin's presentation of the thought of Communion-fellowship; for him the religious focus of the eucharist is union with the continually present Saviour. This he always feels to be something beyond his comprehension and description. Its religious meaning is by no means comprised in the idea of visible signs symbolising spiritual realities, or the image, borrowed from Luther, of the seal which guarantees the truth of the words of promise. He does indeed speak of the bodily eating as a symbol of the spiritual feeding on Christ; "as the bread nourishes and preserves our bodily life, so is the body of Christ the food and the protection of our spiritual life." But here we have no mere symbol; we have the reality. By the sacrament we are assured that he and all his is ours, and we are his. The eucharistic words convey that which they signify. There is no need to define sophistically the manner of the real presence of Christ's body and blood; what matters is, that we possess Christ himself, and share in the grace that he gives. The "matter and substance" of the sacrament is the Lord Jesus.[1]

---

[1] *Corp. R.*, I. 126; *Op. sel.*, I. 146.

[2] V. 441; I. 510. [3] I. 138; I. 120.

At the same time he uses all his logical acuteness to criticise any idea of a local presence in the elements. Calvin saw more clearly than anyone else that it was just this false localising that was the weak point in the mediæval doctrine,[2] while he was also aware of the difference between the theological view of the scholastics and the crude popular view. Here also he criticises Luther. Luther had tried to distinguish between the earthly body of the Lord and his glorified body, and to show that there was no reason why the latter should not be in any number of places at once, or in no place at all, and that it might therefore be present in the sacrament. Calvin replies that a body, so defined, is in fact only another name for a spirit.[3] But the glorified body of the Lord, as it appeared after the Resurrection, could be seen and handled; else it had not been a body. "Thou fool, why dost thou demand of God's power that he should cause flesh to be at once flesh and not flesh? As well mightest thou ask that he should cause light to be at once light and darkness. But he wills that light shall be light, darkness be darkness, and body be body. He can indeed, when he so wills, change light into darkness and darkness into light; but when thou demandest that there shall be no distinction between light and darkness, is not this to pervert the order which has its basis in God's wisdom? So flesh must remain flesh, and spirit spirit, each under the laws and the conditions in which God has created it." If it belongs to the nature of body that it has its definite place, extent and form, the same must apply to Christ's body.

But the logical precision of this analysis leads straight to the special crux of Calvin's doctrine; it follows that the body of the ascended Lord has its local existence in heaven.

[1] V. 437; I. 507. [2] V. 451; I. 521. [3] I. 122; I. 141.

This he energetically maintains time after time, and it recurs in every genuine Calvinistic formula. It is also a significant link with Zwingli; both he and Calvin have at the back of their minds a somewhat crude conception of God as transcendent. Calvin emphasises that we must lift up our thoughts to heaven, and not bring down the heavenly Christ to imprison him in matter.[1] But how then can he speak of a real presence of the Lord in the sacrament?

In the *Institutes* he finds a solution in the idea of the *virtus* of Christ, which is not bound by any local limitation, and conveys to us the benefits of his Passion. But it seems that on this point his thought underwent a development, probably as the result of Lutheran influence, by way of Bucer. In the *Confessio fidei de eucharistia* (the formula of agreement between Bucer and the Swiss, compiled by Calvin, at Bern in 1537) he lays more emphasis on the thought of the flesh and blood, doubtless with the words of institution in mind, and new vistas seem to open up. It is not merely that Christ vivifies our spirit with spiritual life; we actually participate in his body and blood, for otherwise we should not possess the whole Christ. This truth, taught by Paul when he speaks of us as flesh of Christ's flesh, bone of his bones, has depths which human language cannot reach.[2] It is the Spirit who puts a bridge over the abyss which divides our earthly existence from the heavenly Lord.

The *Traicté* (published in 1541) expresses the same point more clearly. Calvin now distinguishes between the "matter and substance" of the sacrament, which is the Lord himself, and its virtue or effect, and he specially emphasises that we must really partake of his body and blood, for the reality, according to God's promise, must accompany the sign.[3] Only so is it possible for us to possess the whole Christ, and "in him the whole perfection of the gifts of grace, which we need." Merely to partake of the spirit of Jesus is not enough; "we need to partake also of his manhood, in which he showed perfect obedience to God the Father, to make amends for our fault."[1] It seems clear here that Calvin has learnt from Luther's later teaching. In the concluding summary, however, he recurs to the thought that it is unworthy to think of Christ as descending to earth to be present in the elements: "Lest we derogate from the virtue of this holy mystery, we are bound to think that it is effected through God's hidden and marvellous power, and that the Spirit of God makes this participation real; wherefore also it is called spiritual."[2]

---

[1] V. 542; I. 521.

[2] IX. 711; I. 435.

[3] "Si Dieu ne peut tromper ne mentir, il s'ensuit qu'il accomplit tout ce qu'il signifie. Il faut doncq que nous recevions vrayement en la Cene le corps et le sang de Jesu Christ, puisque le Seigneur nous y represente la communion de l'un et de l'autre. . . . Nous avons doncq à confesser que si la representation que Dieu nous faict en la Cene est veritable, la substance interieure du Sacrement est conioincte avec les signes visibles; et comme le pain nous est distribué en la main, aussi le corps de Christ nous est communiqué, a fin que nous en soyons faictz participans."—V. 440; I. 509.

The things which are most deeply characteristic of Luther and of Calvin are found not at the points where they agree in rational interpretations, but just where their thoughts are most impossible for our minds: Calvin's localising of the glorified Lord, Luther's *ubiquitas carnis Christi.* The difference between them may depend in part on their different philosophical upbringing; more surely it is a result of the diversity of their religious types. They have different ideas of God. Calvin has always the advantage of clearness. Yet the truths which Luther's awkward formulations are struggling to grasp lie at a depth which the sharp instruments of Calvin's logic are never able to reach. On the other hand, Calvin is to be credited with his deep sense of Communion-fellowship, and of the active oblation of personal devotion.

The teaching of Calvin set its mark on all the Reformed Confessions. The *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549) marks the meeting of Geneva and Zürich; from this time onwards it is scarcely possible to distinguish the Zwinglian and the Calvinistic elements in the Reformed tradition. However, one and all—*Confessio fidei Gallicana*, *Confessio Belgica*, the *Scots Confession* of 1560—agree in asserting some sort of a real presence: thus the Scots Confession says: "We utterly damne the vanitie of thay that affirme Sacramentes to be nothing ellis but naked and baire signes." The most interesting feature of the *Westminster Confession* is the expression of Christian duty (Chap. XXVII. 1): the sacraments "solemnly engage (those that belong to the church) to the service of Christ according to his Word." In general the Reformed Confessions contain a rich supply of positively edifying thoughts, which indeed deserve to become the common property of evangelical Christendom.

[1] V. 438; I. 507.

[2] V. 460; I. 530.

4. The Genevan Rite.

We have seen that, for all its logical clearness, Calvin's eucharistic doctrine contains two sharply conflicting elements: on the one side, his desire to maintain the religious values of the real presence, on the other his conception of the heavenly Lord as exalted far above this world. Would the liturgy succeed in expressing both these central ideas, or would one of the two oust the other? The issue was not determined solely by rational considerations. Three other factors are to be taken into account.

The first is Calvin's personal feeling towards the Catholic mass. Both Luther and Zwingli had been priests, and had gained an inside knowledge of the Roman service, which Calvin never had; and Luther at any rate always retained the religious impression which it had made upon him. But Calvin had no such tender feelings to contend with; and his invective against it is marked with a recklessness and violence which are without parallel. His letter *De fugiendis impiorum illicitis sacris* (1537) reads like the discharge of a long-cherished hatred. In the mass, under its fair exterior, " all that a criminal godlessness could devise is done."[1] The priest is an *impurus sacrificulus*, who believes that Christ descends on to the altar to be slain anew under his sinful hands. With biting scorn he follows the solemn entry of the celebrant, who thinks that his ordination has made him a mediator between God and man, to his foolery with magical mumblings, by which he believes that he can call Christ down from heaven and offer him as a sacrifice,[2] while the people remain in dumb adoration, " nihil non eorum divinum esse persuasus." And is not the little wafer which is elevated in its spotless whiteness the worst of all idols? For Calvin the whole mass was " monkeying ";[3] and from its liturgy he would allow no material whatever to be drawn for the evangelical communion service.

Calvin's hatred towards the Host forms one of his most characteristic differences from Luther. He always found it hard to forgive Wittenberg for its liturgical conservatism, even though this must be tolerated for freedom's sake; and he tried to shift the blame on to Luther's disciples.[4] He finds real pleasure in saying beautiful words about liberty in externals; yet in the *Traicté*, side by side with the rejection of transubstantiation and the faith that in the Supper the Lord bestows that which is symbolised, he lays down as a dogma the principle of the greatest possible simplicity in the manner of celebration, and that the contrary is not merely needless but positively harmful.[1] We have in Calvin a liturgical radicalism more extreme than Zwingli's.

---

[1] V. 239; I. 289. [2] V. 258; I. 309. [3] V. 455; I. 524.

[4] Cf. Doumergue, *Essai sur l'histoire du culte réformé*, p. 87 ff.

This may be illustrated by the short sketch of a ritual in the first edition of the *Institutes*.[2] The Supper (which should be celebrated as often as possible, at least weekly) should begin with prayer and preaching; then the ministers of the word should set the bread and wine on the table and recite the account of the institution, with a calling to mind of the Lord's promises, and an excommunication of those who are forbidden to communicate. There should then be prayer that the Lord would help us to receive his gifts with faith and true thankfulness, and in his mercy make us worthy of so great a banquet. During the communion there should be psalm-singing or reading; whether sitting or kneeling communion is contemplated is not clear. After the communion there should be an exhortation to " loyal faith and witness, to charity and a manner of life worthy of a Christian," and finally a thanksgiving and a hymn of praise before the people depart. Such a simple service, he thinks, would manifest God's glory and allow the sweetness of consolation to fill the hearts of the faithful better than all the childish and theatrical follies of the mass.

Second, there is the influence of the rite already in use at Geneva. This was the first French Reformed liturgy, the *Maniere et fasson*, ascribed to Farel, and printed at Serrières near Neuchâtel in 1533. It was therefore in existence, if not in regular use at Geneva, at Calvin's first visit; and on his return in 1541 it was in possession of the field.

The *Maniere et fasson*[3] is preceded by an introduction, Zwinglian in its general character; the material bread is a symbol of the spiritual, but the service is above all a corporate act, to remind the communicants that they are brethren, and that they need to live by Christ, just as their bodies are sustained by the material bread. The service itself begins with a rather didactic exhortation, explaining the meaning of the rite; then follows a confession, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and then a shorter exhortation, leading to the words of institution, which again are followed by an explanation that the institution is intended only for those who truly desire to follow the Lord in self-renunciation and in love, and a warning not to regard only the visible elements, but lift up the heart to that which is in heaven. Then the communicants are invited to approach the holy table in gladness of heart and brotherly unity; it appears, therefore, that sitting communion is not contemplated. During the communion a form might be repeated, expressing the desire that Jesus, who sits in glory at the Father's right hand, may through his Holy Spirit dwell in the hearts of those who receive, and impart to them his life. Then there is another exhortation, to thank God for his mercies and pray that through his Holy Spirit he will make all to be one; those who are members of Christ ought to separate themselves from the ungodly and from worldly ways, showing their love in their words and their lives. Finally, there is a short blessing. After this manner should the elect believers, in all "the places which God in his mercy has visited," celebrate the Lord's Supper.

---

[1] V. 457; I. 526.

[2] I. 140; I. 161.

[3] A. Doy, *Les liturgies de la Sainte Cène dans les églises réformées de la langue française* (Paris, 1891); Doumergue, *Essai*, p. 21 ff.

There is something striking in the primitive simplicity of this form of service; but it would scarcely be possible for any rite to strip itself more completely of the liturgical element. Apart from the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, common prayer and praise have completely disappeared, and didactic exhortations have taken their place. By comparison, Zwingli's *Action oder Brůch* is a ritualistic service.

There were other ways in which Calvin's liturgical work was influenced by circumstances at Geneva. Some of his proposals met with determined opposition from the Council. It was the order for the use of unleavened bread at the Lord's Supper that was the occasion of the expulsion of Farel and Calvin in 1538; and even after his return he failed to introduce the frequent celebrations which he had already in the *Institutes* declared to be desirable, and was compelled to make other concessions also in the final shaping of the liturgy.

The third factor was the influence of Strassburg. We have seen that his connection with Bucer probably had a considerable effect in the development of his ideas about the eucharist; but there is no doubt at all that the forms of service used in the French congregation at Strassburg, of which he took charge in 1538, had a marked influence on his liturgical work. We saw in an earlier chapter how Bucer had developed a form of service, mainly of a Reformed type; the sacrament was treated as an appendage to the preaching-service—though for a time it was celebrated every Sunday[1]—the liturgical year disappeared; and by the year 1525 the eucharistic liturgy had dwindled to an exhortation following the prayer for the church, the recital of the institution, the communion, a psalm of thanksgiving, final prayer, and blessing. The interesting point is the singing of the psalms. We have here the actual origin of this typical feature of all later Reformed rites. A French refugee, in a letter to Bishop Briçonnet, written in 1525, gives an enraptured picture of the service in Strassburg, that blessed city, and specially mentions the effect of the blending of the men's and women's voices in the singing of the psalms.[2]

Though we only possess the rite used by the little French congregation in an edition of 1542,[3] it corresponds with this German form; Calvin therefore took it over much as he found it. The preaching-service is followed by the singing of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, a prayer for worthy reception, the recital of the institution, an excommunication of open sinners, and an exhortation to receive communion as a gift of God. Psalm 138 was sung during the communion, and after another prayer, the *Nunc Dimittis* before the final blessing. It seems to be certain both that this form of service was not composed by Calvin, and that it is the direct model of that which he introduced at Geneva.[4]

That rite, the type and model of the Calvinistic liturgy, was published at Geneva in 1542: *La forme de prieres et chantz ecclesiastiques avec la maniere d'administrer les sacremens et consacrer le mariage, selon la coustume de l'eglise ancienne.*[5] The title shows what he had learnt at Strassburg; Farel's service had allowed no singing, at least in the Lord's Supper. The preaching-service is here a complete whole, consisting of *adiutorium* (" Nostre aide soit au nom de Dieu "), confession, psalm-singing, free prayer and sermon, followed by the general prayer for the church, a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, and blessing. On communion days, a prayer for worthy communion (from Strassburg sources) is to be included in the prayer for the church, and the sermon also is to refer to the communion.

The communion rite begins under a special heading, marking its separation from the regular Sunday service:

---

[1] Smend, *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen*, p. 158 f.

[2] Doumergue, p. 8.

[3] P. 10. It was printed at Strassburg. The title-page reads: " Imprimé à Rome par le commandement du pape, par Theodor Bousz allemant, son imprimeur ordinaire."

[4] Doy, p. 29 f.

[5] *Corpus Ref.*, Vol. XXXIV.

La maniere de celebrer la cene. The prayer for the church is to be followed immediately by the Creed, and the recital of the institution, according to 1 Cor. xi. Then follows, as at Strassburg, an act of excommunication, with an unedifying list of various sorts of sinners; and the communicants are exhorted to examine themselves, whether they repent of their sins and purpose to lead a new life, whether they trust in God's mercy, and desire to live in charity. "If we have this witness in our hearts, then we doubt not that he counts us as his children, and that the Lord Jesus addresses to us his word, to invite us to his holy Table, and offer to us the sacrament which he gave to his disciples." In spite of our sins, we may be assured by God's mercy that we may rightly approach his spiritual table. "For we come not to proclaim ourselves to be perfect or righteous in ourselves, but rather, seeking in Christ Jesus our life, to confess ourselves to be in death. Let us then understand that this sacrament is a medicine for poor sick men, and that all the worthiness which the Lord demands of us is that we should hate our sins, and have all our joy, gladness and peace in him alone." Let us then "in faith embrace his promises, namely, that he will in truth make us partakers of his body and his blood, that we may so possess him altogether that he may dwell in us and we in him. And though we see nought else than bread and wine, yet let us not doubt that he effects spiritually in our souls that which he sets forth outwardly by these signs, namely, that he is the heavenly bread for the refreshing and nourishing of our souls unto eternal life. And let us not fail to be thankful to our Saviour for his infinite goodness, who on this table displays all his richness and his gifts, to impart them to us. For in giving himself to us he testifies to us that he is wholly ours. Let us therefore receive this sacrament as a pledge (*un gage*) that the virtue of his Passion and death is imputed to us for righteousness, as much as if we ourselves had suffered." We must therefore not merely treasure the gifts bestowed upon us, but "with burning zeal offer ourselves to him, that he may make us worthy to receive him."

Then follows an echo of the Preface, in which Calvin sees something corresponding to his own thought; but he links with it an unedifying controversial digression:[1] "Let us therefore lift up our spirits and our hearts to heaven, where Jesus Christ is in his Father's glory. And let us not stay at these earthly and corruptible gifts, which we see with our eyes and touch with our hands, so as to seek him there, as though he were enclosed within the bread and the wine. For our souls will be ready to be nourished and quickened by his essence, only when they are lifted up above all earthly things, so as to come even to heaven and enter into God's kingdom, where he dwells. Let us then be content to have the bread and wine as a sign and a witness, while spiritually we seek the Truth where God's word promises us that we shall find it."

---

[1] There is a great deal of truth in the remark of Daniel, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiæ universæ*, III. p. 161: "Calvinus, et ipsi convivio cœlesti accumbens, numquam non sumit bellicum sagum. Multa ex iis quæ præcedunt pulcra sunt et movent animum: hæc mala parenthesis a dulcissimi Jesu necessitudine nos rapit ad pugnacium theologorum tumultus, medium in agmen, in pulverem, in clamorem, in castra."

Upon this exhortation follows the communion, during which psalms are sung, or suitable passages are read from the Scriptures. The first edition of *Prieres et chantz* contains no words of administration; but the second edition (1545) provides words in which the real presence is explicitly asserted: "Prenez mangez, le corps de Jesus qui a esté livré à la mort pour vous"; and "C'est la calice du nouveau testament au sang de Jesus, qui a esté respandu pour vous." The celebrant receives first, and then administers to the deacon and to the people, who approach the table; consequently sitting communion was not practised. As at Strassburg, Psalm 138 is appointed to be sung at the communion, and after it a prayer of thanksgiving from the Strassburg form. Then follows the Aaronic blessing; the second edition adds before the blessing the *Nunc Dimittis.*

We have already noticed that in the Calvinistic church the sacrament never came to take the central place which Calvin himself desired that it should have. Repeatedly he emphasises the desirability of frequent communion; thus, in the *Ordonnances* of 1537: "It were much to be desired that the administration of Jesus Christ's holy Supper should take place at least every Sunday, when the multitude are assembled, in view of the great consolation which the faithful derive therefrom. . . . It was not instituted by Jesus in order that men might do this in remembrance of him two or three times a year, but for a continual exercise of our faith and our love, which the congregation of Christians should use as often as they meet together." So it was with the breaking of bread in the Acts of the Apostles, and so it was in the early church. But in view of the weakness of the people, and lest "ce sacre et tout excellent mystère" should be dishonoured, if celebrated so often, Calvin contents himself with requiring that it be celebrated at least once a month in one or other of the three churches of the city. This concession is explained by the Council's refusal to accept the principle of frequent communion; and it must have been the same opposition that made it impossible for him after his return to carry out his wishes on this point. So the celebration of the communion continued to be limited to the three great festivals, and once in the autumn.

A somewhat similar result can be seen in the matter of Penance. At Strassburg Calvin had pleaded for and put into practice a form of Confession in which, as in Lutheranism, the didactic element was prominent. But at Geneva the means taken to guard the sacrament from misuse came to be limited to the exclusion of the unfit through excommunication. In spite of opposition, the right of exclusion was retained in the church's power. But under the theocratic constitution it necessarily assumed a political character; it could after all be used as a method of coercing the civil government. So the rite of communion itself took something of a legal character; and communion became, even more completely than in Lutheranism, the right and the duty of the citizen. So it came to pass that little room was left, and little need felt, for any special act of preparation; and again, that the forgiveness of sins never took the central place in Calvinism which it had in Lutheranism. The scrupulous self-examination, which there all but completely ousted the sense of Communion-fellowship, was here almost as completely absent, except for a sentence or two in the liturgy itself. Hence the Calvinistic service ran a real risk of superficiality, while as an act of fellowship it retained a central place in the corporate more than in the spiritual life of the church.

We come now to our question: Can the communion service which thus took shape at Geneva be called an adequate expression of the idea of the sacrament which we find in Calvin's dogmatic writings? The answer must be a decided negative. The Genevan rite came into being more under the pressure of external circumstances than as the creative expression of a clearly defined view; in this respect it is immeasurably inferior to the work of Zwingli and Œcolampadius at Zürich and Basel. The chief special feature of the Calvinistic service is the psalm-singing; but even this finds only scanty room in the eucharistic rite. The long exhortation which takes so large a part of the rite not only introduces into the central act of Christian devotion the unedifying list of open sins, and goes off into a controversial digression; but it is in itself a liturgical monstrosity, or rather a piece of preaching, and it fails to give a worthy expression of the strong positive elements of the Reformed view: eucharistic praise, communion-fellowship, commemoration, and the offering of personal devotion. The first of these is almost confined to the 138th Psalm; the second, apart from the act of communion itself, is expressed only in the exhortation to charity; commemoration is all but absent, and the ancient traditional forms of the liturgy, rich in links with the past, are more completely abolished than even by Zwingli; and the sacrifice of personal self-oblation is only very shortly mentioned. Instead, most of the space is taken up with giving a correct definition of the mystery of the sacrament. But even here the emphasis on God's transcendence above the whole material creation robs the element of Mystery itself of its deepest meaning; for, after all, the *raison d'être* of the bread and wine is not to direct our thoughts to the Lord who is far away in heaven, *localiter circumscriptus*, but to testify that he has condescended to redeem and take to himself the earthly and the material.

Here at least the rite is genuinely Calvinistic. It reveals with the greatest clearness the essential incompatibility of the theological ideas of Calvin with the mystery of the sacrament. It is true that spiritual communion with God is for Calvin himself a mystery, whose tremendous reality is only deepened by the thought of God's infinite transcendence above this world. But this thought has no immediate connection with communion; the visible nature of the signs which symbolise spiritual food and spiritual communion with God constituted really a difficulty which the liturgy ought to have found a way to overcome. The mysticism of Calvin has perhaps a Johannine element in it, but without the idea of immanence, without the Incarnation. It was therefore logical and natural enough that the eucharistic act should be robbed of a ceremonial dress which might surround the outward signs with a special holiness; it was natural also that no relics of the old mass should be allowed to remain, to mediate something of the spirit of the ancient service. The result at any rate is evident; Calvin's meagre liturgy provided only a very defective expression for the deep and spiritual thoughts contained in his eucharistic teaching.

Yet perhaps the obvious inconsistency between the theology of Calvin and his liturgy has helped to form the characteristic type, rich and vigorous, of the Reformed eucharistic tradition, as of the whole stream of religious life that had its origin in Geneva. But we must remember at the same time that Zürich and even Strassburg had contributions of their own to make, and also that the Reformed churches absorbed to a large extent the "spiritualising" and rationalistic elements in the Reformation.

5. The Reformed Rite on the Continent.

French Switzerland and France.

The direct heirs of Calvin were the French and Franco-Swiss Protestants. Though the Strassburg use was followed originally by a number of Huguenot congregations, and continued to exercise a certain influence,[1] the Genevan rite became dominant in the course of the sixteenth century, and, without ever being officially adopted, came into practically universal use.[2] The chief interest of the French line of development is the process by which its meagre outline was enriched with material drawn from the mass. This is a tendency which meets us in quite a number of places in the Reformed tradition, and it forms a striking testimony to the indispensable worth of the classical forms of the eucharistic liturgy.

The earliest instance occurs in Switzerland. While Geneva, under Zwinglian influence,[3] contented itself with the barest forms, Osterwald of Neuchâtel was responsible for a notable effort to provide richer forms for the church service as a whole, and for the communion service in particular.[4] This liturgy, printed at Basel in 1713, begins with a prayer for worthy communion, and the account of the institution from 1 Cor. xi. The exhortation is based on Calvin's, but the excommunication is much softened down, and his definition of the nature of the mystery is cut out; instead, the exhortation ends as an act of praise, in the old language of the Preface and *Sanctus*, with proper prefaces for Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. This is followed by an intercession for the church, and (in words reminiscent of the Roman canon) "for all thy servants whose faith and devotion are known to thee, who desire to partake at thy table; who pay their vows to thee, the living and true God, who proclaim the death of their Saviour, and who look for his last and glorious advent to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to all according to their works. Vouchsafe to receive favourably our humble prayers, that by the communion of the death of thy Son, and the efficacy of the precious blood which he shed on the cross, we may be saved in that day from the wrath to come, and be found worthy to be received with all the elect in the glory of thy Kingdom. . . ." Then follow the Lord's Prayer, and a confession and absolution. All this is conducted from the pulpit; now begins "la consécration qui se fait à la Table." A prayer of thanksgiving introduces the words of institution: "Receive our prayers and our praises, O merciful God, which we offer thee through Jesus Christ, who in the night that he was betrayed. . . ." The words of administration are: "Remember that Jesus Christ your Saviour died for you, and give him thanks." This liturgy is full of thanksgiving and praise, and includes, after the communion, the *Nunc Dimittis* and the *Gloria in excelsis*.

---

[1] Doumergue, *Essai*, p. 118 ff.

[2] Doy, *Les liturgies de la sainte Çène*, p. 35 ff.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 52 ff.

[4] This communion service is printed in Daniel, *Codex liturgicus*, III. pp. 163–70.

However, in spite of its incomparably greater liturgical richness, the view of the sacrament reflected in it is nearer to Zwingli's than to Calvin's; there is little of the element of Mystery, and Christian fellowship is regarded as symbolised by the rite, not effected by its means. We know from other sources that Osterwald was notorious for his opposition to Calvinistic orthodoxy,[1] and also for his liking for the Church of England, whose forms he regarded as nearer than any others to those of the primitive church. If Doumergue[2] is guilty of exaggeration in regarding this liturgy as borrowed from the *Book of Common Prayer*, its influence is evident enough.

In more modern times, the Calvinistic tradition has on the whole maintained its ground in the French Reformed Church, though both Lutheran and Anglican influences can be traced. It is worth noting also that liturgy has served as a valuable corrective to rationalism. Doumergue has some words which are applicable to other evangelical churches: "Chassé de la prédication, l'Évangile se réfugie dans la liturgie, dans la confession des péchés, dans les symboles des Apôtres, dans la liturgie de la Sainte Cène. Dans ces cas, la liturgie contredit, contre-balance, neutralise, corrige. Grâce à la liturgie, il y a un lien entre le culte le plus rationaliste et le culte le plus évangelique."

---

[1] Doumergue, p. 146.

[2] P. 141.

The question of liturgical reform received a new impulse through the form published by E. Bersier in 1874;[1] it is a rite which for spirituality and beauty of language can have few rivals in Christendom. It is used regularly at the l'Étoile church in Paris; various parts of it have come into use in many other churches, and it has been very largely responsible for the movement towards richer forms of worship in the French Reformed Church to-day.

Two forms of communion service are given; to be used according as the communion service is or is not part of the regular Sunday service. In the latter case a sort of *missa catechumenorum* is provided, with an invitatory, a confession and absolution, *Kyrie*, *Gloria Patri*, and two lessons, from the Old and the New Testament. The communion service proper begins (in either case) with the account of the institution from 1 Cor. xi., and an exhortation (not obligatory), modelled partly on Calvin's form, with a modified excommunication, and the directing of attention away from " these earthly and corruptible elements " to the " divine substance " of the Lord's gift in communion. It proceeds: " He has offered one sacrifice for sin, says the Scripture, and by this one offering has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Let us celebrate here this eternal sacrifice; let us adore the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world and has redeemed us by his precious blood. He wills to make us partakers of his flesh and his blood that we may become living members of his spiritual body. . . . It is he who is our life. To be separated from him is death. Let us then so receive him by faith that he may ever live and reign in us. . . . He wills that in being united with him we may be united also with all those who are the members of his body, with our brethren who with us serve him on earth, with those who have passed from this evil world, with all the saints who have set on him their hope, and adore him now in light and in full fruition of eternal love, with those whom Jesus Christ has redeemed by his blood out of every race, every tongue, and every nation. Let us contemplate by faith this cloud of witnesses, this family of which God is the Father; let us seek in his presence those who have died and are alive; and in the communion of the universal church give glory to the God of our salvation."

---

[1] Doy, p. 61 ff.

When the exhortation is read, it is followed by the singing of *Gloria in excelsis*. The minister now stands behind the table, and reads a prayer for the blessing of the elements, which continues thus: "We are not worthy to offer thee anything in return for so great a sacrifice. Yet, confessing that thou art our God and we thy servants, we offer thee our souls and bodies which thou hast redeemed, we dedicate ourselves to thy service, and pledge ourselves to follow henceforth thy holy will. . . ." Then follows the Preface, with the introductory responses, and variables for Christmas, Good Friday, Easter and Pentecost, and the *Sanctus*; then a prayer for the universal church, followed by silence. Then, "in communion with all the holy souls whose memory we honour, with the redeemed of all generations, we pray thee, O God, to receive the homage of our adoration, our love and our prayers; and do thou order our days according to thy will, deliver us from condemnation, and receive us in the number of thy elect, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." [1]

The words of institution follow, accompanied by the manual acts; then an Anamnesis, and the Lord's Prayer, and the communion. The communicants sit round the table, and the words of administration are said once only for each sitting: "The bread which we break is the communion of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was broken for us"—"The cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of our Lord Christ which was shed for us"; and after all have received, "Depart in peace." The service ends with a thanksgiving which gives a noble expression to the thought of communion as the fount of renewal of life and sanctification, and the blessing.

Another interesting point in Bersier's rite is that it contains a form for the communion of the sick; in this respect it is unique in the Reformed churches. Here also the thought of Communion-fellowship finds a remarkable expression: "My brother (sister), since God in his inscrutable providence does not permit you to be present at the holy assemblies of his people, and you in your loneliness desire to share in the communion of the body and blood of our Saviour, you shall prepare yourself by a humble and sincere confession. . . ."

A really trustworthy account of the place of the sacrament in the French-speaking Calvinist churches would require a thorough study of their religious life, the hymns, the official and unofficial teaching, and the devotional literature, such as cannot be undertaken here. We may mention, however, an address by Pastor E. Hécler at a Swiss Pastors' Conference in 1923,[1] containing a devout and constructive exposition of a view of the sacrament, Zwinglian rather than Calvinistic; and a book of devotion, *Pour communier*, by W. Monod.[2] This latter book can hardly be praised too highly, and it is one of the strongest witnesses to the reality of the rediscovery of sacramental life, which is one of the most hopeful signs in Christendom to-day.

---

[1] A reminiscence of the *Communicantes* of the Roman Canon.

German Switzerland, South Germany and Holland.

We may now take a passing glance at some other sides of Reformed church life on the Continent, chiefly as an introduction to our study of the Anglo-Saxon tradition, in which this type has borne its richest fruit.

In German Switzerland sitting communion has been widely retained, after the pattern of the original use of Zürich. The celebrant, assisted by his "Kirchvorsteher" (who in this connection are called "Kelchhälter"), takes the sacred elements to the communicants in the pews, even up into the gallery. But the Calvinistic use, according to which the communicants come up to the table, is also to be found, sometimes both uses in the same canton. There are four communion days in the year, at Christmas, Easter, Pentecost and the rogation-day in September, which is peculiar to Switzerland. But in the city of Basel there is a celebration in one or other of the churches every Sunday. So too the statements made about the sacrament are very various. For many the thought of the peril of unworthy communion is a terrifying reality; on the other hand, a most interesting light is cast on modern Zwinglianism by the fact that in some cantons, such as Zürich, the circle of communicants is actually wider than that of the ordinary congregation: "everyone who regards himself as even half a Christian goes to communion, even if otherwise he never sets foot inside a church the whole year round."[1] There could be no clearer sign that here the holy rite has become a mere formal confession of faith.

---

[1] La notion des sacrements dans l'Église réformée contemporaine, in *Acts de la Société pastorale suisse*, 74me assemblée à Lausanne, 1923.

[2] "Et ce répas mystique est, en même temps, un sacrement; c'est-à-dire, sans aucun idée magique, un moyen de grâce, la représentation sensible d'une réalité spirituelle, une matérialisation miséricordieuse de l'esprit, une incarnation de Dieu. Car 'toutes les voies de Dieu aboutissent à la corporéité.' Le sacrement de la sainte cène proclame ainsi l'unité de l'âme et du corps, l'unité du monde visible et du monde invisible, l'unité de la vie et de la mort." Monod, *Pour Communier*, p. 34.

We have alluded elsewhere[2] to the group of South German churches (Baden and Württemberg) where the confessional basis remained Lutheran, but the liturgy belonged mainly to the Reformed type. An example is seen in the Rhenpfalz rite of 1567,[3] which, apart from a certain tediousness, must be reckoned as one of the finest of Reformed liturgies. Lutheran usage is followed in the appointment of a service of preparation on Saturday, but the communion service itself is Calvinistic in type, beginning with the Pauline record of the institution, and then the exhortation. But here, instead of the dogmatic exposition of *Prieres et chantz*, we have a sort of Anamnesis, which recounts the story of God's mercies through Christ, specially dwelling on some of the incidents of the Passion, and so passes to the words of institution. The exhortation goes on to speak of incorporation of the communicants into Christ's body, and their fellowship with one another; it is the Pauline Communion-fellowship, and we meet again the phrases from the *Didache* about the many grains and the one bread. It is true that this unity is treated as dependent on faith rather than on the sacramental gift; but even so, certain genuine ideas of primitive Christianity are here made vividly real, which had otherwise been all but lost in the Lutheran churches. Then follows a communion prayer, dwelling on devotion to Christ, the bread of heaven, fellowship in the New Covenant, and grace to bear the cross, to watch for the coming of the Lord, and at last to be transformed into likeness to his glorified body; then the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, and then the Calvinistic warning not to stay at the earthly elements but to look up to heaven. During the communion, John xiv.–xvii. or Isaiah liii. might be read; and the thanksgiving includes Ps. 103. This liturgy survived in part in the Halle *Agenda* of 1788, and in a proposed rite issued by Hugues in 1846 for the churches in Lower Saxony.

In Holland, the basis of the whole liturgical tradition was, and is still, the rite composed by Joh. à Lasco in 1550 for Dutch refugees in England.[4] This service, like à Lasco's other work, forms a link between continental and British

---

[1] Stuckert, *Kirchenkunde der reformierten Schweiz* (Studien zur praktischen Theologie, IV. 2), p. 112.

[2] p. 125 f.

[3] Printed in Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, III. 170–83.

[4] *Forma et ratio totius ecclesiastici ministerii*: See Rietschel, *Liturgik*, I. 417.

Protestantism; his treatise on the Sacraments, dedicated to King Edward VI, exercised considerable influence on the English Reformers. The language of à Lasco's prayers is somewhat dry and theological, and lacking in inspiration. The Lord's Supper is for him an act of commemoration and a meal of fellowship, and the element of Mystery has no place. But the real interest of this rite lies in the attempt which is made to reproduce the form of an actual supper; and it provides the model for the very interesting development of this idea by the Puritans in Great Britain.

The communion is celebrated at the end of the morning service. First the pastor reads the excommunication from the pulpit, and then a prayer for worthy communion, and the Pauline account of the institution. Then, going to the table where the other ministers and elders are already sitting, he takes his place at the middle of the table, facing the people, and invites them to approach and sit down; but the place opposite the pastor is left empty. With the words "The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ," he breaks a loaf, and so places on two smaller plates sufficient bread for those seated at the table. Then he fills four cups with wine; receives of the bread, and passes it round to the others, with the words, "Take, eat, and remember that the body of Jesus Christ was offered for us on the cross." When the bread has gone round, he takes a cup, and saying, "The cup of praise, wherewith we give praise, is the communion of the blood of Christ," he drinks first himself, and sends the cup round with a similar form of words to that used for the bread. When all have received, others take their places at the table. The elders collect the plates and cups, and watch to see that no stranger presents himself. During the intervals there is reading from the pulpit—John vi., which in spite of, or thanks to, Zwingli, has always been the favourite communion-text of the Reformed churches—then John xiii. and xiv. The service concludes with an exhortation to thankfulness, a prayer of thanksgiving with a reference to the heavenly feast to which the communion looks forward,[1] and a short discourse on some subject connected with communion.

---

[1] "Spero item vos omnes, in vestro ad Cœnam hanc accubitu intuitos esse fidei vestræ oculis beatum illum in regno olim Dei accubitum, cum Abrahamo Isaaco et Jacobo. Tamque vos de illo iam certos esse fiducia iustitiæ, meriti et victoriæ Christi Domini (in quorum communione nunc obsignati sumus) quam certo nunc ad mensam hanc Domini una omnes accubuimus."

6. Anglo-Saxon Calvinism.

Scottish Presbyterianism.

The purest representative of Calvinism in the Anglo-Saxon world is the Church of Scotland.[1] The basal document here is Knox's *Book of Common Order*, 1564. "The Maner of the Lordes Supper" in this book contains rubrics based on the use of the English congregation at Geneva; the rite as a whole, with its sitting communion, is more reminiscent of à Lasco, but the forms are somewhat fuller, and include a eucharistic prayer with thanksgiving for creation and redemption. During the communion "some place of the Scriptures is read, which doeth lively set forth the death of Christ, to the intent that our eyes and senses may not onely be occupied in these outward signes of bread and wyne, which are called the visible word; but that our hearts and mindes also may be fully fixed in the contemplation of the Lord's death, which is by this holie Sacrament represented." The service ends with a thanksgiving "for so excellent a gift and treasure," and for being received "into the fellowship and company of Christ"; Psalm 103, and the blessing. But Knox did not bind his ministers to fixed formulæ; and this freedom has always been characteristic of the Church of Scotland.

The *Book of Common Order* assumes that the sacrament is celebrated monthly; but it was not long before the usual Reformed practice of four communions a year prevailed here also. As the days appointed were the first Sundays of March, June, September and December, the Scottish church dealt with the liturgical year in an exceptionally radical way; the result was that the element of Commemoration in the eucharist was reduced to its absolute minimum, the memory of the Passion. Similarly, the rejection of the old ceremonial of the liturgy robbed the service of valuable expressions of the note of joy.

The attempt that was made in 1637 to introduce an Anglican liturgy into Scotland drove the Covenanters to make common cause with the English Puritans. Consequently the great effort that was made, in the Westminster Assembly, to unite all the Protestantism of Great Britain in one form of faith, worship and church order, was of fundamental importance for the Church of Scotland also. Her only legal standard of worship is still the *Directory for the Public Worship of God*, 1644.

---

[1] For the *Scots Confession*, see p. 170.

The order for the Lord's Supper in the *Directory* begins with a declaration that it ought to be celebrated often; but the actual frequency is left to be decided by the local congregation. There is also a remarkable emphasis on the preparation for communion; the celebration is to be announced on the preceding "Sabbath," and either then or during the week instruction on the sacrament is to be given, "that all may come better prepared to the heavenly feast." On the day itself an exhortation about the sacrament is to be added to the usual service, emphasising the peril of unworthy reception, but also offering a special invitation to those who sigh under the burden of their sins; but, as usual in Reformed rites, there is no special confession and absolution.

After the exhortation the communicants take their places at the table, as in à Lasco and the *Book of Common Order*. "The minister is to begin with sanctifying and blessing the elements of bread and wine . . . having first in a few words showed that these elements, otherwise common, are now set apart and sanctified to this holy use by the word of institution and prayer." The Pauline account of the institution is read, and may be followed by an explanation. Then the central act of "prayer, thanksgiving and blessing" begins; no binding formulæ are given, but the general tenor of the prayer is indicated. There shall be a recognition of man's wretchedness, and thanksgiving to God for all his benefits, "and especially for that great benefit of our redemption, the love of God the Father, the sufferings and the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, by which we are delivered; and for all the means of grace, the word and the sacraments; and for this sacrament in particular, by which Christ and all his benefits are applied and sealed up unto us." And again, "that there is no other name under heaven whereby we can be saved but the name of Jesus Christ, by whom alone we receive liberty and life, have access to the throne of grace, are admitted to eat and drink at his own table, and are sealed up by his Spirit to an assurance of happiness and everlasting life." Finally, prayer is to be made that he will "vouchsafe his gracious presence and the effectual working of his Spirit in us, and so to sanctify these elements both of bread and wine, and to bless his own ordinance, that we may receive by faith the body and blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us, and so feed upon him, that he may be one with us and we with him; that he may live in us and we in him, and to him, who hath loved us and given himself for us."

The actual breaking of bread and the delivery is a ceremony of peculiar solemnity, and is accompanied by these words or the like: "According to the holy institution, command, and example of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, I take this bread, and having given thanks, break it and give it unto you" (there the minister, who is also himself to communicate, is to break the bread and give it to the communicants): "Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of him." In like manner the minister is to take the cup and to say in these expressions (or other the like, used by Christ or the Apostle upon the same occasion): "According to the institution, command and example of our Lord Jesus Christ I take this cup and give it unto you" (here he giveth it to the communicants): "This cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ, which is shed for the remission of the sins of many; drink ye all of it." The communion is to be followed by a short exhortation, and a thanksgiving, with prayer for the pardoning of whatever has been amiss in the service, and for the help of the Holy Spirit "to walk in the strength of this grace, as becometh those who have received so great pledges of salvation."

It would be hard to find anywhere a piece of ritual which for sheer dramatic power can compare with this creation of the Puritan spirit. The whole of this liturgical outline is marked by a stronger grasp of the element of Mystery than the older Reformed rites. It retains and develops the positive features of Calvin's work, and leaves on one side the rhetorical allusions to the worthlessness of the corruptible elements, and the thought of the exaltation of Christ to a local heaven; the leading thought is rather that of his presence that he may enter into the hearts of the faithful and unite them with himself.

The centrality of the element of Mystery is further indicated by the stress laid on preparation for communion. In the old communion-feasts of the Scottish church the services of preparation often occupied the whole of the previous week; famous preachers gathered large crowds from near and far, and many of the people camped out in the open air. The preparation, which included a fast-day, had a penitential character such as is rare in the Reformed churches; [1] and so strict was the examination of conscience that very many refrained from communion for dread of the awful judgment which must fall on all who received the sacrament unworthily. Since the evangelical revival has tempered the austerity of the old Scottish religion, the communion services have become festal solemnities, full of holy joy. But it seems that certain Highland congregations still show relatively low numbers of communicants, by reason of the awe which surrounds the sacrament in the popular mind.

---

[1] Within living memory in Scotland, fast-day services were held on the Thursday preceding, and thanksgiving services on the Monday following the sacrament.

It is remarkable that the instructions in the *Directory* scarcely contain any direct expression of the idea of Fellowship. But it is to be remembered that the minister was always free to fill in the outline as he chose, and also that the social aspect was peculiarly emphasised by the fact that the communicants sat round the table. This usage was still practised in the early nineteenth century; in the seventeenth century we hear of tables being laid for as many as 600 communicants. The modern custom is that the people remain in the pews, but the pew-fronts are covered with white cloths, and the holy table itself must always retain the appearance of a table; it must never be made to look like an altar.

The number of celebrations has remained, in spite of the *Directory*, at three or four in the year; on the other hand, it is regarded as the duty of every active church member to communicate. The elders call on church members before the communion observance; in the old days they delivered "tokens," or small metal tallies bearing the words "This do in remembrance of Me," to be given up on going forward to the Table, but these are now replaced by cards. A church member who absents himself from the sacrament may expect a visit of inquiry from his elder. The communicants' roll is revised yearly by the Kirk Session, and anyone who absents himself from communion for three consecutive years is after due warning removed from the list.[1]

In recent years the Scottish churches have been active in both theological and liturgical work. The former reflects the strong revival in Calvinism, called out by the evangelical movement of the nineteenth century, and by the need of finding answers to the problems raised by natural science and Biblical criticism. In this work, as commonly in Anglo-Saxon theology, not only the Atonement but the Incarnation, and consequently also the sacrament, take a central place. Perhaps the Calvinistic starting-point offers special oppor-

[1] *Digest of Church Laws, and Decisions relating to the Church of Scotland* (ed. 1923), p. 98 f.

tunities for a sound eucharistic theology; for while the doctrine of the local exaltation of Christ in heaven has dropped out of mind, this tradition includes a strong grasp of the reality of the presence in the eucharist, together with a refusal to localise it in the elements. A modern Scottish theologian is indeed reproducing Calvin at his best, in teaching that the benefits of communion cannot be identified with some particular gift such as the forgiveness of sins, but that "the nature and the greatness of that gift can only be expressed by saying that it consists of Christ Himself." [1]

By his body and his blood, this writer proceeds, Christ intended himself, his personality. The receiving of a transcendent personality may be illustrated from the analogy of the vitalising influence which radiates from every strong soul. The "analytic" identification of the bread and wine with the physical body and blood of Christ is an "afterthought," which is really misleading. To regard the presence of the Lord as a spiritual fact is in no way to derogate from its reality; and the writer has a very clear perception of the significance of the material elements: their part is to set forth for us the reality of Jesus' bodily life, thus carrying on the principle of the Incarnation. Since, however, "these emblems have a reference not merely to Christ as he was, but as he is, we are reminded of the eternally human character of Jesus, and of the fact that so far from having discarded connection with our human nature, he has rather taken up that nature into himself to dignify and spiritualise it for ever." [2] It seems clear that here the religious values of Luther's doctrine of the real presence are all saved, and expressed in a manner more intelligible to our age; the bread and wine, as the vehicles of the spiritual presence of Christ, set forth his earthly passion and triumph as not merely facts of past history, but realities belonging to the eternal world. "The exalted Saviour carries within himself the gathered force of his redemptive achievement. . . . The proper gift, then, of the Sacrament is the manifold entity of the God-Man as he now exists." [2]

---

[1] Adamson, *The Christian Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Edinburgh, 1905), p. 152. He says of Luther: "It was only natural that one who magnified justification by faith as almost the sum and substance of the gospel should view the central Christian rite in the dazzling light of that glorious doctrine. And it will always be natural that every man's view of the Rite should be vividly coloured by his distinctive apprehension of the Gospel." Adamson's work seems to me to be one of the best of modern statements of the doctrine of the sacrament.

[2] *Ib.*, pp. 156, 157.

Similar thoughts, if less fully worked out, are expressed by an English Presbyterian, Anderson Scott, who propounds what he calls the Reformed Catholic view, as distinguished from Anglo-Catholic doctrine on the one hand, and pure symbolism on the other.[1] He too maintains the reality of the presence, while refusing to localise it in the elements: "It is not in any part of the sacrament, or in any sacramental action that he is present, but in the whole. It is not any part of him that is present, but it is the complete Christ, especially in the redeeming grace of his sacrifice, that is given afresh as often as we communicate, and it is this that we receive." He also lays stress on the sacrifice of personal self-oblation, together with that of praise and prayer, as the only sacrifice which the Christian can offer. The thought of Communion-fellowship is so fundamental to the Reformed type in general that it does not require special illustration.

It is more remarkable, that in some modern Scottish theology we find a new estimate of the Memorial-aspect, of the pleading of the one sacrifice as the highest form of prayer: "It is, further, the utmost *act of prayer*. The appeal to God which faith continually makes in every supplication,—'for Jesus' sake'—here takes the form of action. We say, 'Know thou whether this be thy Son's Body broken, thy Son's Blood that was shed for us.' We say, 'Know thou whether we be not those sinners for whom Christ died.'"[2]

In all the three branches—now united—into which the Church of Scotland was divided there have been groups working for liturgical reform. The most interesting of the prayer-books which have appeared is *Euchologion, a Book of Common Order*, published by the Church Service Society for use in the established church;[3] the eucharistic liturgy from this book has received a certain authorisation by being used at the General Assembly. The form now commonly used on such occasions is a closely similar form, issued by the (semi-official) Committee on Aids to Devotion. We shall, however, quote from the *Euchologion*, as this form seems to have had the widest influence; by 1924 it was in its eleventh edition.

The service follows closely the plan given in the *Directory*, but fills in the outline with material drawn from the liturgical treasures of the Universal Church. Thus the introductory exhortation after the sermon ends with the old *Sancta sanctis*: " United with him who is holy, even our Lord Jesus Christ, we are accepted of the Father, and invited to partake of these HOLY THINGS WHICH ARE FOR HOLY PERSONS." During the collection, sentences from Scripture are read, and then the communion service proper begins with the Grace and the Pauline record of the institution. Then follows the " setting apart of the elements," which is made into a separate ceremony, and may be preceded by an Address about the meaning of the sacrament, which dwells on the Incarnation, the sacrifice of the cross, and the sacramental union of the faithful with the Lord and with one another; " And as by His death, resurrection and ascension He hath obtained for us the life-giving spirit, which, dwelling in Him as the Head, and in us as His members, unites us all in one body, we are to receive this Supper in brotherly love and mindful of the communion of saints. For we, being many, are one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. We are to rejoice in that holy fellowship wherein we have part with the faithful patriarchs and prophets of old; the holy apostles and evangelists; the blessed martyrs and confessors; the redeemed of all ages who have died in the Lord, and now live with Him for evermore; our fathers, our brethren, our children, and those who were as our own souls; believing that though our eyes behold them no more, they have not perished, but that as Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him; and that when the day breaks, and the shadows flee away, we shall meet them again in glory and joy."

---

[1] *Evangelical Doctrine Bible Truth*, 2nd ed., 1901.

[2] Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, *A Manual of Church Doctrine*, p. 76.

[3] *A Book of Common Order* (Oxford, 1928) prepared by the Church Worship Association of the former United Free Church, and authorised by the General Assembly of that Church should also be mentioned.

This is followed by the Nicene Creed; a confession of sin; the threefold *Agnus Dei*; an absolution and a kind of offertory prayer. Then comes the *Sursum Corda*, answered by " We lift them up unto the Lord," and followed immediately [1] by " It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty . . ." The Preface is longer than in the Roman and Anglican rites; it is invariable—for a traditional aversion to the liturgical year takes a long time to die—it contains a thanksgiving for the Incarnation and Atonement, for the gift of the Holy Spirit and his operation in the church, and for the hope of everlasting life, and so leads up to the *Sanctus*, with *Benedictus* and *Hosanna*. The continuation of the eucharistic prayer includes epiclesis and oblation: " And we humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to vouchsafe to us Thy gracious presence, and so to sanctify with Thy word and Spirit these Thine own gifts of bread and wine, which we set before Thee, that the bread which we break may be to us the communion of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing which we bless the communion of the blood of Christ. And we beseech Thee to receive this memorial of the blessed sacrifice of Thy Son, which He hath commanded us to make until He come again; in union with whom we offer unto Thee our souls and our bodies, and present unto Thee our prayers, entreating Thee to grant unto us and unto all Thy people, through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, the remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. Amen."

---

[1] Other modern Scottish forms add the second versicle and response: " Let us give thanks unto our Lord God," etc.

Then follow the Lord's Prayer, the breaking of bread, and the communion, according to the solemn form of the *Directory* (p. 188); after this there is the *Pax*-salutation. Then may follow, as in the *Directory*, an exhortation relating to thankfulness for communion and to a holy life: "Let us therefore show forth His praise from this time for evermore, glorifying God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are His; ever walking worthy of His grace, and of our high calling in Christ Jesus." This form strikes a genuinely Calvinistic note; but in the *Euchologion* it is optional, and in place of it an "Intercession for the Church Militant" may be used, ending with a fine thanksgiving for the Church Triumphant. Finally, according to a very old Reformed tradition, the *Nunc Dimittis* (or a hymn) and the blessing.

This eucharistic rite, based on the classical scheme of the *Directory*, and yet freely drawing on the noble forms of the ancient Christian service, is one of the most interesting liturgical products of modern times. Rooted in the deepened and emancipated Calvinism of modern Scottish theology, it ranks with the liturgy of Bersier as marking the highest point which the Reformed tradition has attained. It is evident that the element of Mystery, the relative neglect of which in the early reformed liturgies and doctrinal formulæ was their outstanding defect, has here been recovered, and found a worthy and a thoughtful expression. The pity is that the ceremonial forms prescribed by law as well as by church tradition prevent justice being done to the Memorial-aspect, though this side of the eucharist is by no means absent from the liturgical texts; and again, that, though the aspect of Commemoration is up to a point nobly set forth in the *Euchologion*, it can never come into its rights without the revival of the liturgical year.

The English Free Churches.

We must first notice certain of the English Nonconformist bodies, which can only doubtfully be included within the Reformed tradition. The Unitarians historically represent the development of the "spiritualising" tendency; a study of their eucharistic usages would be of real interest, because it would show how the mysterious power of the sacred rite can assert itself even against a rationalistic theology. To quote Adamson again:[1] "However easy it may be in the school to contend for a rationalistic Christology, the atmosphere of the Sacrament seems to induce feelings of adoration that amount to worship of Christ as divine." The Quakers alone draw out the "spiritualising" tendency to its full consequences; the result is that they may be a society of saints, but cannot be called a church. The Catholic Apostolic or Irvingite sect exhibits certain Calvinistic features in Irving's sacramental teaching; but its interesting liturgy is mainly drawn from Eastern sources. Nor can the Methodists really be said to belong to the Reformed tradition; their ways of worship show very clearly their Anglican origin, even though there is a tendency for them to become assimilated to those of the older Reformed nonconformity. The Methodist communion service scarcely deviates at all from the Anglican form, except that there is permission for extempore prayer at the end; and the strong sacramentalism of the Wesleys has by no means been altogether lost. It would be both interesting and profitable to study the various movements of eucharistic thought that have from time to time appeared in the various branches of Methodism.

But Congregationalism, for all its lack of uniformity, is a thoroughly characteristic Reformed type, more radical than Presbyterianism; more logical in its relation to the state, and unfettered by law and tradition—so much so, that the individual congregation is not bound even by the Calvinistic formulæ themselves. For the purposes of our present study we may group the Baptists with the Congregationalists; for in regard to eucharistic doctrine and practice there is to-day no practical difference between the two.

The basal document for the eucharistic doctrine of the older Congregationalism is the *Savoy Declaration* of 1658, though it never became legally binding as did the *Westminster Confession* in the Church of Scotland. Like the latter document, it expresses a moderate Calvinism, and emphasises the real but spiritual nature of the sacramental gift. Modern statements based upon it may express views closely similar to those which we have studied in Presbyterianism. Thus in R. W. Dale's *Manual of Congregational Principles* (1884) we meet once again the parallel between the Incarnation and the eucharistic elements: "The Eternal Word became flesh; and this is infinitely more wonderful than that he should use material things as the memorials of his death and the vehicles of a present revelation to the Church."[1] The sacrament brings to mind the permanence of our Lord's humanity; but it is more than a mere symbol or image, for in it all that the bread and wine symbolise is actually bestowed. The elements imply the reality—just as the handing-over by the defenders of the key of a besieged city implies the actual fall of the city. And Communion-fellowship is thus expressed by Dale: "In the Lord's Supper the free and friendly relations of the Lord Jesus Christ with his apostles are extended to all Christian men and women of all countries and ages."[2]

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 142 f., 226.

Dale was, however, anxiously asserting this view of the sacrament in conscious opposition to a newer view, such as found expression in the *Declaration of the Faith, Order and Discipline of the Congregational or Independent Dissenters*, formally accepted by the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1833; though this did not mean that it became binding, any more than any other form, on any individual congregation. This declaration, says Dale, excludes even the didactic interpretation (of the sacrament), and "leaves absolutely nothing except an expression of subjective religious life on the part of those who receive; 'it is to be celebrated by Christian churches as a token of faith in the Saviour and of brotherly love.' That is all." And when we find that the Declaration is reprinted regularly in the *Congregational Year-Book*, we may infer that this is the view that is most common in modern Congregationalism.

This type is then an instance of the most radical form of Reformed doctrine, in which all is subjective; the deeper religious aspects of the rite are ousted by the idea of a glad feast of fellowship, of the communicants with one another rather than with the Lord; and even the Commemoration of the Passion has become a mere confession by the individual of his personal faith. But Congregationalism contains within itself many divergent views, and certain later writers,

[1] P. 155.

[2] P. 147.

such as Forsyth,[1] have again sought to dig deeper and make the doctrine of the sacrament centre round devotion to the Passion.

Congregationalism is always unwilling to accept any liturgical form as binding; just as it is a matter of principle that any member of the congregation may be invited to celebrate the sacrament. This freedom does not, however, prevent the establishment of a more or less regular usage. A typical celebration[2] will generally include (1) a hymn, appropriate to the service; (2) a Communion Address or introductory meditation, usually, *but not always*, leading up to (3) the words of institution; (4) an act of thanksgiving (eucharist); (5) the communion, the bread and wine being administered separately, each with its own form of words, and carried round to the pews by the deacons; (6) a prayer, often including the Lord's Prayer; but sometimes this is said immediately after the distribution of the bread; (7) a hymn, expressing both thanksgiving and personal self-dedication; and (8) the blessing.

The most remarkable feature in this sketch seems to me to be the possibility that the words of institution may not be used at all, even though "should they be omitted the intention of the whole service would be held to make that fact non-essential." Again, the fact that no need seems to be felt for any special act of preparation is peculiarly striking by the contrast with Presbyterian usage; where the element of Mystery has been lost, there will be no sense of any necessity to guard the Mystery from profanation. The place of the communion in the life of the church is predominantly that of an act of congregational fellowship and confession of faith. A monthly celebration is usual in the Free Churches, and anyone who is absent from three consecutive communions may be called to account for his negligence; but this rule is not strictly enforced.

Yet even in Congregationalism the need has been felt in the last half-century for greater fixity in liturgical forms—a fact which may be noted as a peculiarly interesting sign of the universality of the movement of our generation towards liturgical revival. The *Book of Congregational Worship*, issued in 1920 by the Congregational Union of England and Wales, is naturally not imposed as of obligation, and room is left for the traditional extempore prayer; but its avowed aim is to save the congregation from " the tyranny of the pulpit," and the minister from the burden of shaping a fresh liturgy on every occasion, without help or guidance. Many of the prayers collected here are of great interest, especially the Prayers and Collects for special occasions; but the most interesting feature of all is the manner in which the classical forms of the eucharistic liturgy are seen returning to their own, even in a church where hitherto formlessness has been the only law. The influence of the *Book of Common Prayer* is evident throughout; but the first part of the service, the mass of the catechumens, has not been restored.

---

[1] *The Church and the Sacraments*, London, 1917.

[2] According to information kindly supplied by Prof. Vernon Bartlet.

The service begins with (1) a series of texts, not unlike the Anglican "Comfortable Words"; (2) the Invitation, "Ye that do truly . . ."; (3) a confession of sin; (4) Preface, invariable, leading up to the *Sanctus* (without *Benedictus* and *Hosanna*); (5) the words of institution, 1 Cor. xi. 23–26; (6) a suggested prayer including commemoration, the sacrifice of praise and of personal self-dedication, and fellowship: "O Lord and heavenly Father, in the fellowship of thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we commemorate his last Supper with his disciples, and his offering of himself in the sacrifice of the Cross; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits thus procured unto us, entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all who are partakers of this Holy Communion, being fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, may be made one body with thy son Jesus Christ, that he may dwell in them and they in him. Amen." (7) Silent prayer; (8) the communion, the words of administration being "This is my body which is broken for you"—"This cup is the new Testament in my blood"; (9) The Lord's Prayer; (10) Intercession for the church; two alternative forms, one of them taken from the old prayer from the *Didache*; (11) *memoria defunctorum*: "we bless thy Holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear (especially those who have been present with us at thy Table) . . ." (12) hymn of thanksgiving; (13) *Gloria in excelsis*; (14) collection, during which texts from Scripture are read; and (15) the blessing. It is not necessary to enter on any detailed discussion of this rite, but it may be said that it is a happy and well-proportioned form, well worthy of study wherever liturgical reform is under consideration.

In a variety of ways we have seen how the Reformed Rite has again and again striven to overcome its original poverty. These efforts testify to the religious depth and the catholicity of the deeper ideas of the eucharist, and the irresistible beauty and power of the classical forms of the ancient liturgy. But the chief result of our study is to show how those elements which have been most emphasised in the Reformed tradition—namely, Thanksgiving, Commemoration, and above all Fellowship—have there attained a richer development than in other traditions whose religious depth has on the whole been greater. Therefore the Reformed tradition can serve as a valuable corrective to other types; not least to Lutheranism, with its penitential gloom and heavy individualism.

CHAPTER VI

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

1. The Older Anglicanism.

THE episcopal Church of England has commonly been regarded on the Continent as a member, but in some respects a perverse and self-willed member, of the family of the Reformed churches. It has been so classed on the ground of its historical connections with Geneva and Strassburg, and the character of its doctrinal formulæ; the fact that its constitution and liturgy are modelled on ancient church tradition has commonly been treated as a mere illogicality, involving, however, dangers that are becoming more and more apparent.

But closer study of the Church of England is bound to reveal at once the impossibility of this view, and to show that this church is unique among the churches of the Reformation, and cannot be placed in any of the categories with which continental Protestant theologians have been accustomed to work. Its development was determined at least as much by the humanism of the Renaissance as by Reformed theology; and the new ideas which flowed in from abroad were not able to master and to re-shape the whole life of the church. The result was the dualism of doctrine and practice which remains one of the essential factors in its modern history, the root alike of its weakness and of its rich variety. We have therefore to reckon with a special Anglican eucharistic type; and its recent development forms one of the most instructive chapters in modern church history.

Doctrinal formulæ of the Reformation period.

The doctrinal history of the English Reformation is only of secondary interest; it contains little creative originality, much imitation and compromise. But the problem of the eucharist took a prominent place from the very start. The title *Defensor fidei* was earned for the kings of England by Henry VIII's treatise against Luther's *De captivitate babylonica*

—a presage, perhaps, of the eucharistic controversies of modern times. Henry upheld the dogma of transubstantiation with the help of the stake as well as of the pen; and though the *Articles* of 1536 were not irreconcilable with Lutheranism,[1] the *Six Articles* of 1539 and the *King's Book* of 1543 maintained transubstantiation without any reserve.

When the accession of Edward VI gave freedom to the new ideas, Geneva had taken the place of Wittenberg as the spiritual centre of the Reformation. In 1548 Cranmer issued an English version of the Lutheran Catechism of Justus Jonas; but the two works of his own which he published in 1551 were definitely Calvinistic in tone.[2] Between these two dates an event of great importance had occurred; Bucer had arrived in England, and had published his statement of sacramental belief in 1550. It is unnecessary for our purpose to distinguish the effect of his influence and that of Geneva; and from this time the typical utterances of the reformers and the phrases of the various Articles express a moderate Calvinism. Whenever it is possible to distinguish the expression of Cranmer's own thoughts from the statements forced on him by outside pressure, it is Genevan ideas that we hear:[3] ideas of the spiritual food and the real grace attached to the outward sign, and bestowed by the Ascended Lord. Ridley distinguishes between the corporeal and the spiritual presence in terms that are plainly Calvinistic, but would hardly have been unacceptable to Augustine.[4] Latimer sometimes verges on Zwinglian modes of expression.[5] But there is no doubt of the Calvinistic character of the *Forty-five Articles* of 1551, which appeared again in a revised form as the *Forty-two Articles* of 1553: "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death"; for the faithful communicant it is a partaking of Christ's body and blood. The Article of 1553 goes on to express an assertion that the body of Christ cannot be at the same time in heaven and on earth.

It is in the light of the earlier statements that the *Thirty-nine Articles*[6] of 1571 must be studied. Art. XXV describes the sacraments as "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us . . ." Art. XXVI declares that their efficacy does not depend on the worthiness of the minister; and Art. XXVIII, on the Lord's Supper, significantly omits the declaration about the impossibility of Christ's body being at once in heaven and on earth, and emphasises instead the "heavenly and spiritual" nature of the presence. We have the testimony of Bishop Guest, the author of the Article, that the change was intentional, and that the Article was intended to exclude not "the presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof."

---

[1] Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, II. 113 f.

[2] *Ib.*, II. 128.

[3] *Ib.*, II. 179 ff.

[4] *Ib.*, II. 188.

[5] *Ib.*, II. 196.

[6] See Bicknell, *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles* (2nd ed., 1925).

Like all the documents of the Reformation, these Articles bear the stamp of the controversies out of which they arose. Their origin is evidently Reformed, though they give only incomplete expression to the positive elements of the Reformed conception. On the other hand, the alteration of Art. XXVIII was a real emancipation, and in its final form the article did not exclude a deeper view. But the positive impulse in that direction came not from the doctrinal side, but from the liturgy, which escaped the danger of being revised in accordance with a theological scheme, and became a place of refuge for the positive religious values which can never thrive in an atmosphere of theological controversy.

The Liturgies of the Reformation Period.

Under Henry VIII the Latin mass remained unaltered; but after his death changes came in quick succession.[1] The *First Book of Homilies* came out in 1547; it was ordered that one should be read every Sunday, and that a copy of Erasmus' Gospel paraphrase should be provided in every church; that the Bible should be read in English at Mattins and Evensong, and also at High Mass. Thus in England as in Germany the first step to the creation of a new liturgy of the mass was the reading of the lections in the vernacular. The next step was that at the opening of Parliament in the autumn the *Gloria*, Creed and *Agnus* were sung in English; and general permission was given for communion to be administered in both kinds.

In 1548, the chief objective of the reformers was to make every mass into a communion, and in some London churches mass was no longer celebrated if there were no communicants. At Easter, Cranmer's *Order of Communion* [1] was issued by authority; it consisted of a series of texts to be inserted in the Latin mass after the communion of the priest, which still remain in the present English service, with only verbal alterations. The origin of these forms is partly mediæval, and in part a peculiarly interesting document from Germany, the *Simplex et pia deliberatio* issued by Archbishop Herman of Cologne; this was written in German by Melanchthon and Bucer, but an English translation was made from the Latin in 1548.[2] This is the source, among other things, of the Comfortable Words, which are so striking a feature of the present English service.

---

[1] For the following see Proctor and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 35 ff.

The *First Prayer Book of Edward VI* was put forth in 1549, for use in all churches. It had been prepared by a committee, which had Cranmer and Ridley for leaders, but included also moderate supporters of the old régime.[3] The result of their work was one of the most interesting of all the liturgical products of the period of the Reformation. The attention that was here paid to the breviary offices has been of decisive importance in moulding English church life. The Church of England is unique among the churches of the Reformation in possessing in regular use the two daily offices of Mattins and Evensong. Neither the Lutheran churches, which in spite of repeated efforts never succeeded in recreating the Breviary tradition, nor the Reformed churches, which preferred to go to the Breviary rather than to the Missal for such traditional material as they used, succeeded in preserving so rich a store of liturgical treasures as the Church of England.[4]

The eucharistic rite of 1549 followed in the main the mediæval order. The vestments were retained; a psalm was sung as an Introit, and was followed by the Lord's Prayer and Collect for purity, the ninefold *Kyrie* in English, and the *Gloria in excelsis*. After the collect for the day the Prayer for the King was added; the Epistle was followed immediately by the Gospel, no Gradual being provided.

---

[1] Consisting of Exhortation, Invitation ("Ye that do truly"), Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, Prayer of Humble Access. Brightman, *The English Rite*, I. lxxii f.; II. 650 ff.

[2] Brightman, I. lxx f.; Proctor and Frere, 27 ff.

[3] Proctor and Frere, p. 45 ff.

[4] It ought, however, to be remembered that in Sweden the chief services of the Breviary remained in use till the early seventeenth century, being chanted in churches and schools in either Swedish or Latin, in an adapted form.

The sermon followed the Nicene Creed, and after it the exhortation from the *Order of Communion* might be used.. The collection at the Offertory restored the primitive offering of gifts as a regular feature of the service. The communicants were then to take their places in the choir, but there was no suggestion that non-communicants should withdraw. Then followed the *Sursum corda*, Preface, and *Sanctus*, and then the long Canon, composed of (1) the Intercession, corresponding to the present Prayer for the Church, but ending with a thanksgiving for the Saints, and a prayer for the departed; (2) the Prayer of Consecration, containing an Epiclesis modelled on those of the Greek liturgies; and (3) the Prayer of Oblation in its original form, containing the Anamnesis, prayer for the acceptance of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the oblation of " oure selfe, oure soules and bodies, to be a reasonable holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee," and prayer for the blessings of communion, above all union with Christ: to " bee . . . made one bodye with thy sonne Jesu Christ, that he maye dwell in them, and they in hym "; and finally, that in spite of the unworthiness of those who offer, their service may be accepted, and that their prayers may " by the Ministery of thy holy Angels be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of thy dyvine maiestie." This was followed by the Lord's Prayer, the *Pax*, a bidding to praise, which might be called a paraphrase of the *Agnus Dei*; then the rest of the *Order of Communion*. After the communion, during which the *Agnus* was sung, the service ended with the Prayer of thanksgiving, and the Peace and Blessing.

This admirable and well-balanced liturgy provided the material which appeared in the later Prayer Books in a mutilated form. Its most interesting feature was without doubt the long canon, which replaced the Latin canon. Doubtless it was a mistake to include in it the " Prayer for the Church Militant," in itself beautiful and worthy, and thereby make the canon over-long. But in the latter part, particularly in the Anamnesis and the Oblation, we have a truly original combination of material from the Latin canon and from other sources. The act of self-oblation (" here we offer and present . . .") seems to be based on the *Pia deliberatio*, and perhaps also on the *Antididagma*, the reply of the chapter of Cologne to the Archbishop's proposals; the same thought is, however, also found in the Strassburg rite of 1525, and it is possible that its occurrence both there and in the *Pia deliberatio* is ultimately due to Bucer. If then the occurrence of these words in the English rite cannot be regarded as a proof of creative originality in the English reformers, it is a sign of a still more uncommon sense of liturgical fitness. In this way the highest of all the forms of the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice, which we have seen coming to expression in Augustine, and again and again since his day, wherever eucharistic piety has been really deep and spiritual, has found a permanent place in the Anglican liturgy; and the prayer in which it occurs is one of the noblest features of the English rite.

But the 1549 Book satisfied only a small minority. The most violent criticisms came from the extreme Protestant wing, and the first outburst of iconoclasm began, encouraged by Ridley. In 1550 a royal ordinance commanded that the altars should be replaced by tables. A strong wave of Calvinism swept the English Church; its effect is seen in the teaching of the *Forty-two Articles* about the Lord's Supper. Pietro Martire Vermigli, now professor at Oxford, joined with Bucer in the outcry against the Book, and the *Censura* [1] of the latter sealed its fate.

The *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI* appeared in 1552. The changes were drastic; not least the order in the introductory rubric, that the table should stand in the middle of the church or in the choir, covered with a white cloth; the priest was to take his place at the north side. Elsewhere the use of the mass vestments was forbidden. It was evidently intended that the communion service was for the most part to be said, not sung,[2] and that only communicants were to be present;[3] and the fact that the sermon was not obligatory is yet another sign that the eucharist was now to cease to be the chief service. The chief alterations in the rite itself are as follows: the Introit disappears, the *Kyrie* is farced within the Decalogue,[4] the *Gloria in excelsis* is moved to the end of the service—a bold change which accentuates the note of thanksgiving after the communion, and has remained as a permanent feature of the Anglican rite—and above all, the long canon is broken up into three, and the service rearranged, so that the communion may follow as closely as possible on the consecration; the words of administration are altered in a Reformed direction, only those words being said which form the second half of the formula now in use.

---

[1] Printed among Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*. Proctor and Frere, p. 72 ff.

[2] Only the Epistle, Gospel, Creed and *Gloria* are permitted to be sung.

[3] In the second exhortation.

[4] A similar usage is found in the liturgies of two foreign congregations that were at this time in England; à Lasco's, and the little French congregation of those who had fled from Strassburg during the Interim. In both these cases, as also in Farel's *Maniere et fasson*, the Decalogue occurred in the ordinary morning service which preceded the eucharist, Brightman, however, regards the English usage as derived from certain of the Lutheran Church Orders: *The English Rite*, I. cxlvi. ff.

Yet even so the liturgy did not satisfy the extreme Protestant party, whose leader was at this time John Knox; and he openly disobeyed some of the rubrics. The chief stumbling-block was the direction that the communicants were to receive kneeling; controversy upon this point delayed the publication of the Book, and when at last it appeared, it was found to contain the "Black Rubric," with the declaration that "it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. . . . For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be in more places than one at one time." Thus, in spite of all his far-reaching concessions to the Reformed view, Cranmer had stood firm and refused to surrender the essential point, the custom of kneeling for communion; hence the dualism between doctrine and liturgical use remained, and survived the reaction under Queen Mary. And the successful struggle to retain the use of the Prayer Book which was waged by the English refugees at Frankfurt against both the civil authorities and extreme Protestants of their own race [1] shows that the *via media* was something more than a mere compromise.

But if it had not been for Queen Elizabeth's influence, the Church of England would assuredly have taken a more puritanical colour. As it was, the Prayer Book of 1559 was in all essentials a re-issue of that of 1552, but the alterations were all in a conservative direction. The words of administration were altered, the Black Rubric was omitted, and above all, the famous Ornaments Rubric was now inserted, legalising the vestments which the Book of 1552 had directly forbidden; but the pressure of Puritan opinion made it quite impossible to put this rubric into practice. In other ways the alterations demanded by the Puritans were carried through; the altars were broken down and replaced by tables, placed endwise in the choir.[2] There followed also, as on the Continent, a rule of more frequent communion. The Book of 1549 had been content with requiring one communion a year, as in the Middle Ages; the minimum according to the Book of 1552 and subsequent Books has been "three, of which Easter shall be one." The daily mass was replaced by a weekly communion service; but it was not long before Reformed influence had diminished the frequency of celebration.

---

[1] Proctor and Frere, p. 93 f.

[2] P. 104 ff.

No evangelical liturgy has remained unaltered so long as the Anglican; for the modern Prayer Book is in all essentials identical with that of Queen Elizabeth. The revision of 1662 introduced few changes of any significance; the chief, perhaps, was the reintroduction of the Black Rubric, with the important substitution of "corporal presence" for "real and essential presence." But the hundred years of strife which ended with Charles II's Act of Uniformity had been of the greatest importance for the church service, as we shall see in the next section. During this period the *Book of Common Prayer* became the banner of the Church party in opposition to the Puritans; for though the Puritan opposition was not as a rule consciously at issue with the doctrinal formulæ, it felt instinctively that the liturgy breathed a spirit which was alien from its own.

Yet, since the holy table had been substituted for the altar, there was little in the service, as it was celebrated in the sixteenth century, that could be directly offensive to the Puritans, except the kneeling for communion and the dress of the priest; and here it was only the white surplice that was in question, which did not belong exclusively to the eucharist. Their representations on these points at the Hampton Court Conference of 1603 were rejected. But the appendix to the Catechism, treating of sacramental doctrine, which was then inserted, scarcely modified the intentional comprehensiveness of the Articles. The Church of England has never directly repudiated any other eucharistic doctrines than transubstantiation on the one side and pure Zwinglianism on the other.

The Caroline Divines.

It was when the strong sacramentalism of the Caroline high-churchmen had revealed the Prayer Book in a new light that it became finally unacceptable to the Puritans. It is true that the Church of England has never lacked representatives of extreme Protestantism—strangely enough John Hales, Laud's chaplain, was a pure Zwinglian[1]—

---

[1] Stone, II. 313.

and the most widespread belief has always been some form of receptionism; but in the reign of Charles I the dominant influence in the church was that of the school of Andrewes and Laud.

Andrewes' thought has for its basis the Johannine mystery-type, and he is strongly influenced by the Greek Fathers. For him the union of the spiritual and the material in the sacrament is analogous with the Incarnation; the gift bestowed in the sacrament is Christ himself, present in his manhood, as in the crib and on the cross; and the benefit of communion is above all to be united with him, and to abide in him. At the same time he expresses very clearly the Memorial-aspect: "Two things Christ . . . gave us in charge: (1) ἀνάμνησις, 'remembering,' and (2) λῆψις, 'receiving.' The same two St. Paul, but in other terms, (1) καταγγελία, 'showing forth'; (2) κοινωνία, 'communicating.' Of which, 'remembering' and 'showing forth' refer to *celebremus*, 'receiving' and 'communicating' to *epulemur* here. The first, in remembrance of him, Christ. What of him? *Mortem Domini*, his death, saith St. Paul, 'to show forth the Lord's death.' Remember him. That we will and stay at home, think of him there. Nay, show him forth ye must. That we will by a sermon of him. Nay, it must be *hoc facite*. It is not mental thinking or verbal speaking, there must be actually somewhat done to celebrate this memory. That done to the holy symbols, that was done to him, to his body and his blood in the passover; break the one, pour out the other, to represent κλώμενον, how his sacred body was 'broken,' and ἐκχυνόμενον, how his precious blood was shed."[1]

Here the eucharist is the sacrificial act of memorial; but he can also speak of offering Christ, in the holy rite; this is the only sacrifice which is fit to be offered to God, and it is the supreme act of prayer: "let us then offer him, and in the act of offering ask him for that which is meet."[2] It is therefore equally right to speak of the altar and of the holy table; the one refers to the sacrificial side of the eucharist, the other to communion.

Rarely indeed has the Memorial-aspect of the rite been expressed in evangelical Christendom more clearly or in a more truly evangelical way than by Bishop Andrewes; and the central place of the sacrament in his own devotional life can be studied in the *Preces Privatæ*, the collection of prayers which he made in Greek and Latin for his own private use.

---

[1] Quoted in Stone, II. 260.

[2] II. 256.

Here he gives thanks for the sacrament as "a token of fellowship, a memorial of the dispensation, a showing forth of the death, a communion of body and blood, a participation of the Spirit, remission of sins, a riddance of adversaries, quieting of the soul, renewal of the covenant . . . mutual indwelling, a pledge of resurrection, acceptable defence in judgment, a testament of inheritance, a stamp of perfection" [1]—but this is a hymn of praise, not a series of definitions, and it suffers in the process of translation from Greek into English prose.

It was Laud's work to give practical and administrative expression to the sacramentalism of Andrewes. Theological definition was scarcely his special gift; perhaps it is true to say that he, like many others, would have regarded it as the special merit of the Church of England that it has abstained from defining the mystery. But the centre of all his administrative work was the revival of the Memorial-aspect of the rite. He regards the eucharist as sacrificial in three senses: first, there is the offering made by the priest alone, "the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out"; second, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, made by priest and people; and third, the self-oblation of the individual.[2]

The practical corollary of this view was the reverence due to the altar, as "the greatest place of God's residence upon earth," and the restoration of the altars to their old position was a central point in his practical administration; this was ordered in a canon of 1640. It was not indeed that the altar in the church was an altar in the literal sense, on which Christ might be immolated anew; it was to be called an altar only in the sense in which the primitive church used the word, and not in any other. It was to have rails in front of it, and a bow should be made to it on entering and leaving the church. The restoration of the altar to its old place put out of date the rubrical direction that the priest should stand at the north side of the holy table.

The sacramental doctrine of Andrewes and Laud found liturgical expression in the revised version of the *Book of Common Prayer*, which Charles I endeavoured to introduce into Scotland in 1637, with no other result than to provoke the Scottish rebellion. Yet the Scottish rite was a highly interesting document in itself, and it has become the parent of a group of Anglican liturgies, which includes the rite of the American Episcopal Church as well as the modern Scottish rite.[1] The dislocation of the canon is remedied, and the act of self-oblation is not only made part of the eucharistic prayer, but also gathers up the thought of Communion-fellowship: "and here we humbly offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee; beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in them, and they in him." [1]

---

[1] Brightman, *The Preces Privatæ of Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 122 f.

[2] Stone, II. 269.

It is one of the tragedies of history that it should have been this admirable liturgy whose appearance gave the signal for the violent reaction of extreme Protestantism against the whole Anglican type. It was in vain that concessions were offered to pacify Puritan opinion. Laud went to the Tower; there was a fresh outburst of iconoclasm; and to the Westminster Assembly which met in 1643 the Book of Common Prayer was just as much an abomination as was episcopal government. Yet, as we have seen, the Assembly showed a really remarkable soundness of judgment and liturgical taste in the eucharistic rite of the *Directory*, and moderation in its pronouncements on eucharistic doctrine. But when the Restoration brought back Elizabeth's Prayer Book, there could no longer be any illusion that the Church of England could comprehend within itself all English Christianity.

During the period of the Restoration, efforts were made to maintain a daily eucharist with communion in some of the cathedrals and London churches; and as late as 1750, as Whitefield tells us, there was daily communion in Lady Huntingdon's Connexion.[2] But this was quite exceptional; as a rule it seems to have been regarded as sufficient to celebrate the eucharist only so often as the Prayer Book required that all should receive communion, that is to say, three times a year, or maybe four. Where a higher standard was aimed at, a monthly celebration was usual; we know, however, that the collegiate church in Manchester, which is now the cathedral, maintained a celebration every Sunday till 1743, when the practice was brought to an end by the bishop.[3]

In proportion as the number of celebrations approached the minimum, the Anglican eucharist approximated to the Reformed type; the sacred rite became an act of Christian fellowship and of confession of faith, in which the whole congregation was expected to take part, and it ceased to be the central act of worship or the regular means of grace. Yet even so the requirement of three communions a year was an advance on the mediæval rule, which the 1549 Book had retained.

---

[1] Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, p. 135; Proctor and Frere, pp. 151, 234 ff., 518 ff.

[2] Wickham Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (1914), p. 29.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 34.

The fast before communion seems to have been regularly observed, at least for a great part of the eighteenth century. It was commonly enjoined in devotional manuals as a devout custom rather than a binding rule; so in "The Pious Country Parishioner" of 1747: "If your Constitution be weak, or any great Inconvenience come from your fasting the Morning you receive, use your Pleasure; but if you are strong and healthy, 'tis best to abstain from Breakfast: for then, your Thoughts will be more fix'd; and you will gain more time to yourself, and the consecrated Bread will be, as it deserves, your first Food."[1] In isolated instances it lingered on well into the nineteenth century, when it was revived by the Oxford Movement. Evening communions were unknown; it is interesting to note that in 1753 the deistic Archbishop Herring of Canterbury suggested that it might be necessary to introduce evening communion in order to counteract the "superstitious" habit of receiving the sacrament fasting.[2]

The legal obligation of communion was altogether evil in its effect on the sacramental life of the Church. While the Act of Uniformity of 1662, which enforced the use of the Prayer Book, excluded from the church a great number of its devoted servants, the Corporation Act of 1661 required that all holders of municipal office must within a year from their entry into office receive the sacrament according to the Anglican rite, and the Test Act of 1672 extended the same rule to members of the Government and of the House of Commons. The disabilities which these laws imposed on the civil rights of dissenters were soon removed,[3] and when the Acts were repealed in 1829 they had for the most part been a dead letter for a century. The more serious aspect of the matter was that the holiest rite of the church was thereby degraded into a means of qualification for civil office.

In no country, perhaps, has this legal bondage of the sacrament been heavier or led to grosser profanation than in England while the Test and Corporation Acts were in force, especially when it is remembered that the Church of England had long ceased to be the church of the whole nation. It can hardly be an accident that the period covered by these Acts coincides with a steady decline alike of frequency of celebration and of sacramental devotion. Their repeal was one of the external causes of the Oxford Movement, and so of the sacramental revival. Yet the liberation of the sacrament from its legal bondage was a necessary condition for the re-birth of sacramental life.

---

[1] Wickham Legg, p. 53.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 55.

[3] Cf. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, p. 94 f.

Traditional Anglicanism.

Before we pass to the nineteenth-century revival, it is necessary to sum up briefly the characteristics of the traditional Anglican type, under the five aspects with which the reader is now familiar.

The aspect of *Thanksgiving* would seem to be fully secured, in the rite of 1662, by the preservation of the Preface and *Sanctus* in their proper order; and the placing of the *Gloria in excelsis* at the end of the service serves rather to accentuate the note of praise, in spite of the relative gloominess of the earlier part, where also the Gradual is wholly omitted, and the Decalogue is added. At the same time the thought of praise occurs in the collect for purity and the Prayer of Oblation; nor is the penitential note so emphasised as to overshadow the aspect of thanksgiving.

On the other hand, in actual practice this aspect certainly failed to receive its due. The eucharist had lost its place as the chief service, and had become practically an appendage to Morning Prayer. It was treated with little honour, and received only an insignificant share of the rich musical elaboration which was lavished instead on the canticles and anthems of the Divine Office.

The manner in which *Communion-fellowship* finds expression connects the Anglican service with the Reformed tradition. The attempt to assimilate the eucharist to a supper was finally frustrated by the Caroline high-churchmen; but the requirement that all church members of good standing should seal their membership by regular communion is thoroughly typical of the Reformed outlook. Communion becomes the testimony to an already existing fellowship, rather than the finding of that unity through the sacramental gift. Yet at the same time the deeper notes of eucharistic fellowship sound through the prayers of the liturgy. The common repetition of the *Kyrie*, Creed, confession, *Sanctus*, Lord's Prayer, and *Gloria* unites priest and people together in congregational worship. Emphasis is laid on love and charity as the condition of a good communion; and in the Prayer of Thanksgiving the Pauline and Augustinian thought of Christian fellowship finds rich expression. In the modern sacramental revival this thought has been developed and deepened. Such hymns as Turton's "O thou who at thy eucharist didst pray" (*Hymns Ancient and Modern* 553, *English Hymnal* 324), and Gladstone's "O lead my blindness by the hand" (*E.H.* 322) reflect the Johannine expression of unity as well as the Pauline:

> "We who this holy precinct round
> In one adoring circle kneel,
> May we in one intent be bound,
> And one serene devotion feel,
> And grow around thy sacred shrine
> Like tendrils of the deathless Vine.
> We who with one blest Food are fed
> Into one body may we grow . . ." (*E.H.* 322).

The *Commemoration* of the Passion is very strongly emphasised in the liturgy, particularly in the Prayer of Consecration, and again in the words of administration; "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee." But Commemoration is not limited to the Passion, as commonly in the Reformed type; for though the rite of 1662 lacks the Anamnesis, which the Scottish rite had regained, it preserves the liturgical year, with the ancient series of lections; and by the five proper prefaces which it has retained it impresses the historical commemoration on the central eucharistic act.[1] There is a reference also to the departed in the Prayer for the Church, but weakened down from the form of the 1549 Book.

The place taken by the *Sacrificial and Memorial aspect* is of special interest. We have seen how the Prayer of Oblation expresses the ideas of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and of personal self-oblation. But we must also note two other points: first, that the ancient offering of gifts survives in the Anglican rite in the collection which is taken at the offertory, and presented at the altar; and second, the Memorial-aspect proper. The rubric which orders the manual acts at the consecration gives a certain dramatic character to the rite, corresponding to the strong emphasis on the One Sacrifice in the first part of the prayer; and though this idea is not further emphasised in the liturgy, it has remained as a living element in the Anglican tradition more than in any other evangelical church. We have seen how dear it was to Andrewes and Laud. It appears constantly in hymns, particularly in the eucharistic hymns of John and Charles Wesley, such as the well-known "Victim Divine, thy grace we claim" (*A. and M.* 556, *E.H.* 333), or the following:

---

[1] In the Non-jurors' liturgy there is a fuller commemoration of the story of redemption, modelled on the Clementine liturgy; Linton, p. 131 ff.

> "O thou eternal Victim, slain
> A sacrifice for guilty man,
> By the eternal Spirit made
> An offering in the sinner's stead,
> Our everlasting Priest art thou,
> And plead'st thy death for sinners now." [1]

The memorial of the One Sacrifice is united with the thought of the eternal self-oblation of the heavenly High-priest, and of the eucharist as the church's act of prayer, pleading by word and act the One Sacrifice. The self-oblation of the church is also made the theme of a hymn:

> "Father, our sacrifice receive,
>   Our souls and bodies we present,
> Our goods and vows and praises give,
>   Whate'er thy bounteous love hath lent;
> Thou canst not now our gift despise,
>   Cast on that all-atoning Lamb,
> Mixt with the bleeding sacrifice
>   And offered up through Jesus' name." [2]

The liturgy thus presented great possibilities for a worthy expression of the Memorial-aspect; but in practice this aspect hardly received the place which it deserved. The eucharist was not the centre of the church's worship and life; it was exclusively a communion service, at which only communicants were present.

Finally, the element of *Mystery* appears in the same double aspect which we have noticed already, and which is symbolised in the two parts of the formula of administration. The Prayer Book repeats the traditional phrases, of the elements as the Lord's body and blood, in the Prayer of Consecration and the words of administration; while the spirit of the Greek Fathers breathes in the Prayer of Humble Access, with its intimate words about union with the Lord, and the cleansing of human bodies by his Body. The mystical side of Christian fellowship finds expression in the Prayer of Thanksgiving. In general it may be said that Anglican piety has always had a strong flavour of the Johannine and Greek mystery-type; the equation of the elements with the Lord's body and blood is constantly related to the Divine self-communication,[1] and the difference from Lutheranism is seen in the mention of the " remission of our sins " as one of the " benefits of his Passion," but not as the central expression of the sacramental gift. The whole rite is full of the atmosphere of reverence and holy fear; the Prayer of Humble Access expresses the sense of deep unworthiness; the fast before communion, and the act of kneeling for communion, both imply the sense of the Mystery; and the term " the holy mysteries " is used in the exhortation.

---

[1] Hymn 5, quoted in Stone, II. 510.

[2] Hymn 153; quoted in Stone, II. 514.

On the other hand, there are phrases which set forth a subjective, " receptionist " view. The Black Rubric, which is the last word of the service as it stands in the Prayer Book, reproduces Calvin's doctrine of the local presence of Christ's natural body " in heaven and not here." The rule of three communions a year must have made the act in many cases a symbol of loyalty to the established order, rather than the meeting of the humble soul with its heavenly Guest: not to mention those whose sole idea was to qualify for Parliament or civil office.

Similarly, the theological pronouncements regularly show the same double aspect, varying between the pure Zwinglianism of the Deists, and a sometimes romanising doctrine of the sacrifice in the Non-jurors and their friends within the Church. But the most common view was a moderate Calvinism, typified and summed up in the name which may stand as typical of the eighteenth century—Waterland.[2]

2. The Anglican Revival.

Modern Anglican writers are often tempted to draw too gloomy a picture of the English church in the early nineteenth century; but there can be no doubt that this was one of the low-water marks of sacramental religion. It is true that the numbers of those who fulfilled their legal obligation of communion was proportionately higher than at a later time; but the sacrament took a very subordinate place in church life, and was not infrequently treated with real irreverence. The effect of the evangelical movement was to accentuate the Reformed features of doctrine and practice, and subordinate the altar still more to the pulpit. In the Swedish church, and other Lutheran churches, the sacrament held an incomparably higher place at this period than in the Church of England—a fact which deserves to be remembered in view of the complete reversal of the position in the hundred years that have followed.

---

[1] Cf. p. 215 below.

[2] See Stone, II. 506 ff.; and cf. Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, p. 316.

The revival which began with the Oxford Movement has been above all a revival of sacramental religion. Its way was prepared by the mysticism of the Romantic movement, and it drew its inspiration from the Greek Fathers and the Caroline divines. I have elsewhere[1] sought to show how the Oxford Movement began by developing the ideas of the Incarnation and of the Divine indwelling, and so came to a new estimate of the sacraments as objective realities and as a means of grace. Alexander Knox, a generation before, had given a moderate and thoughtful expression to the element of mystery in the sacrament; and Pusey's famous sermon of 1843, *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, set forth the ideas of the Greek Fathers with a directness previously unknown in Anglican theology, and also brought into the foreground in an ominous way the old question of the literal identification of the elements with Christ's body and blood. But even if Pusey did not shrink from the idea of the sacrament as the preservative of the body unto immortality, yet this thought of the real presence was always connected by him with that of the Divine indwelling in the heart, as it is in the Prayer Book; and this Johannine point of view has never been lost in modern Anglicanism.[2]

The re-birth of eucharistic piety is the most active of all the forms of fermentation which the Oxford Movement set working in the spiritual life of England. The revolution that was to follow in the life of the church is quite unintelligible unless it is seen that its motive force was a deep stirring of spiritual life. It is indeed the most notable chapter in the modern history of the eucharist.

---

[1] See *The Anglican Revival*, especially Chaps. XII, XIV and XV.

[2] Cf. R. M. Benson, *Spiritual Letters*, p. 10: "Reservation after the Roman manner is objectionable to my mind not because it expresses the Real Presence in the Sacrament too strongly, but because it implies a denial of the Real Presence in the baptised. . . . The Creed gives Baptism the greatest dignity among the Sacraments, mentioning it and no other. Roman theologians, of course, give the Holy Eucharist the greatest dignity. Why? Because they have been able to change the mystery in the one case into a miracle. They could not do this in the other case, where the change was more personal. So practically they let the mystery evaporate altogether."

But our sketch of the place of the eucharist in the Anglican church of to-day must begin with the theological side. The classical statement of a High Anglican doctrine of the sacrament is Gore's book, *The Body of Christ.* The central principle of Gore's thought is that the eucharist is of a piece with the Incarnation. Christianity is the religion of the Incarnation, in which matter is united with the Godhead, used for God's redeeming work, and exalted into the sphere of the Divine; and the use of material means in the sacrament for spiritual ends corresponds to the double nature of man. Definitely rejecting transubstantiation, and any false localising of the presence, he teaches that "the gift of the eucharist is precisely that gift of the flesh, or body and blood of Christ, the spiritual principle and life of Christ's manhood, inseparable from his whole living self." He is aware of the dangers attendant on the worship of the sacrament. His doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice scarcely goes beyond the standards of seventeenth-century Anglicanism; but a new emphasis is laid on the unity of the church's act with the work of the great High-priest in heaven; and the consummation of worship is the church's self-oblation to God. In this noble Augustinian doctrine there is perhaps nothing which cannot be called truly evangelical; and this is the type of eucharistic doctrine which is spreading step by step through the whole Anglican church.

At the same time it must be remembered that the Anglo-Catholic movement has left Gore behind both in teaching and in practice. This is true even of so thoughtful a study as that of Father Waggett, in *The Holy Eucharist* (1906)—not indeed because of the emphasis laid on the lifting up of the earthly rite and the earthly elements into the heavenly sphere,[1] but through the distinction made between the divine presence and the sacramental gift, so that the elements themselves acquire a significance, which opens the door to the degradation of the sacrament to a level which is not the level of Christian faith and religion; even though Father Waggett's own exposition is most carefully guarded against any false identification of the material and the spiritual.[1] But it must also be remembered that this is no mere speculative construction, but, like all genuine eucharistic theology, an effort to give theological form to a reality apprehended in life and in experience. His view, like Gore's, is specially worthy of study for all who would understand this modern Anglican sacramentalism, which does not indeed escape the common danger of being vulgarised by unintelligent practice or by narrow-minded party-spirit, but in the hands of its better representatives can neither be held guilty of debasing and materialising the spiritual truths of religion, nor despised as intellectually inferior; rather it is making the attempt to spiritualise the material, to express that which is incomprehensible.[2]

---

[1] Here, strangely enough, a favourite thought of Calvin is reproduced; cf. pp. 169, 175–6 of this book. Waggett's words are: "Christ has ascended into heaven. There, in Heaven, in the unseen world, in glory, at the Right Hand of the Father, are now his once mortal Body and Blood. We are not to drag down this holy reality into the earthly sphere, that the Treasure of the unseen world and the Light of the heavenly Jerusalem may become the ornament of a circle of carnal experience. That is to bring down Christ from above. No: our thoughts are to rise to Heaven, seeking him beyond the skies, and to press on continually to find these unseen and glorified and exalted realities which are the sole food of our souls and even of our bodies in the order of their redemption."—p. 19

Where less defensible modes of expression are found, they are the result of the influence of party-spirit or of the needs of popular teaching. We may instance a statement accepted at the annual meeting of the English Church Union in 1900, which is practically a popular version of transubstantiation: "that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the bread and wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become in and by consecration according to our Lord's institution, verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, present in the same most Holy Sacrament of the Altar under the form of bread and wine, is to be worshipped and adored."[3] Possibly a collection of quite extravagant phrases could be made out of the multitude of Anglo-Catholic pamphlets and devotional books; however, in those which have come under my notice I have found remarkably little which goes beyond the teaching of such a writer as Father Waggett. The Memorial-aspect of the eucharistic sacrifice is commonly treated as the church's supreme act of worship and prayer; and when the real presence is stated in similar terms to those of the E.C.U. manifesto, there is usually a readiness to give a spiritual interpretation of the mystery, which Luther would have violently repudiated.

---

[1] "'Spiritual identification,' 'mysterious identification.' By such words we do not mean that the natural substance of the elements is the same thing as the substance of the heavenly Gifts. We mean that they are taken into the same mystery. Even as the Body of the Lord is not the same thing with his Divinity, but is taken up into the same Personality with the Divine Nature, the same personal Life; so also in the Eucharist the earthly elements are taken up into the same reality with the Body and Blood"—p. 9, note.

[2] A moderate and thoughtful study of the central problems of eucharistic theology is to be found in O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments* (1927). Quick's own statement of the doctrine of the real presence seems to me particularly well-balanced and carefully worded: see esp. pp. 225 ff.

[3] Quoted in Stone, II. 558.

Roman influence is evident in the emphasis laid on the moment of consecration, and in the explanations given for extra-liturgical devotions: and these present at times a strange contrast with phrases taken from the Greek Fathers. But to determine the actual scope of purely Roman influence a detailed investigation would be necessary, based primarily on a study of the large and increasing variety of tracts and books of devotion. For the extreme Romanising wing of the movement the needs of the devotional life form almost the sole criterion; intellectual considerations are ignored, and it is only asked whether this or that idea is helpful to devotion to the sacrament; while a Roman origin is rather a recommendation than otherwise. It is true that the influence of this section is often exaggerated; but it constitutes a danger for the healthy development of the movement, and it has shown a strong tendency to take the leadership of the party into its own hands. Even in so intellectually eminent a representative of this section as W. Knox [1] there is to be found, side by side with deep and valuable thoughts, a pure doctrine of transubstantiation in an English dress.

We cannot attempt to follow out in detail the different views current in the Anglican church, with their wide divergences. The note of the Reformed tradition is still to be heard in the eucharist teaching of *Liberal Evangelicalism*, a recent book which formulates the programme of the party that bears that name, even though in other ways this book shows how much the newer evangelicals have learnt from the high-church as well as from the liberal school of thought. H. B. Gooding, the writer of the essay on the church and sacraments, has indeed a high view of the Memorial-aspect, as " the ' dramatic ' representation of our Lord's words and acts," and of the sacrificial side of the rite as the church's act of worship, including the communicants' self-oblation; but he interprets the real presence quite subjectively, as a presence in the heart of the recipient, dependent on his faith: " He can be said to be specially present because He is specially realised."[1] This means that the element of mystery has in reality been abandoned.

---

[1] *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England* (1923), p. 63 ff.

But the deepest utterances of the evangelical school approach quite near to the high-church standpoint. There are some deservedly well-known words of the late Bishop Moule of Durham, at a Conference held at Fulham Palace in 1900: "I believe that if our eyes . . . were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our communions. There and then, assuredly, if anywhere and at any time, He remembers His promise, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My Name there am I in the midst of them.' Such special presence, the promised congregational presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact, no creation of our imagination or emotion, but an object for our faith. I believe that our Lord, so present, not on the Holy Table, but at it, would be seen Himself in our presence to bless the bread and wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples . . . I believe that we should worship Him, thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy and love. We should receive the bread and wine with a profound sense of their sacredness as given by Him in physical assurance of our part, as believers in Him, and so as members of Him, in all the benefits of His passion."[2]

There is here a deep, spiritual grasp of the eucharistic mystery, in its true evangelical sense; and it is hard to conceive a more spiritual devotion. But it is no exaggeration to say, that it is the renaissance of sacramental religion in the high-church revival which is here seen bearing fruit in the evangelical party; for it has revolutionised the teaching and practice of the entire Church of England. Bishop Moule's view would probably be regarded by Father Waggett as scarcely adequate, and his definite refusal to attach the presence directly to the elements[3] is directly opposed to the localising tendency which is coming more and more to characterise the Anglo-Catholic school, and is sometimes accentuated in a dangerous way by the practice of reservation; yet it is only a difference in degree between Moule and the more liberal Anglo-Catholics. So K. E. Kirk, discussing the question whether the real presence is "in the service" or "in the elements," says: "We are also justified in protesting against the suggestion of localisation insinuated by the emphasis on the word 'in,' which, as Catholic theology has always insisted, has no local significance, but merely implies that the consecrated elements are the 'matter' of which the Presence is the 'form.' But if controversy forces us to choose between the two alternatives suggested, it is surely no more than reasonable to suggest that the 'visible focus' (if we may use the expression) of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist must be that for which and around which the congregation is gathered, rather than the gathering together of the congregation; otherwise the whole act of consecration and communion becomes merely secondary, and its omission would not affect the ultimate spiritual value of the assembly." [1] There is no really irreconcilable difference between such a view and that of W. R. Inge, in *Contentio Veritatis*: "The presence of Christ in the Eucharist, then, is real because, when we partake of it, the Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that Christ is present with us. And it is His will that we should realise His presence most vividly by means of those symbols which He has appointed for us and ordered us to use." [2]

---

[1] *Liberal Evangelicalism*, pp. 162, 163.

[2] Quoted from Stone, II. 584.

[3] "I do not think that the Holy Scriptures give us reason to believe that this sacred procedure (which we cannot see, but which is truly present to faith) involves any special attachment of His presence to the sacred signs, albeit called His body and His blood by reason of their equivalence as divine tokens."—Moule, *ibidem*.

The hymns in common use are both important in themselves and instructive to the student. A self-drawn picture of the operative ideas about the sacrament is given in the two books now most common, *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, and the *English Hymnal*; while a number of eucharistic hymns are common to both books, the latter gives a stronger impression of Catholic sacramentalism than the former. Perhaps no evangelical church possesses a hymn in which the eucharistic note rings out so clear as in Chatterton Dix's "Alleluya, sing to Jesus" (*A. and M.* 316, *E. H.* 301); another that is eucharistic from end to end is "For the beauty of the earth" (*E.H.* 309); while "According to thy gracious word" (*E.H.* 300) is wholly dominated by the idea of Commemoration.

But the special characteristic of the eucharistic section of the *English Hymnal* is the space given to translations. These are mostly from ancient and mediæval sources, but there is also the pearl of Lutheran communion hymns, Franck's "Schmücke dich," "Deck thyself, my soul, with gladness" (306). There are two from the Liturgy of St. James (310 and 318); one from the Bangor Antiphoner, the Celtic communion-hymn from the seventh century, "Draw nigh and take" (307), and four from Thomas Aquinas. This selection is typical of the desire of modern Anglicanism to profit by the best experience of the universal church. The actual continuity of the faith of the Church of England herself is well illustrated by a comparison between Charles Wesley's "Victim Divine, thy grace we claim" (333), and W. Bright's "Once, only once, and once for all" (327); both these hymns treat of the one sacrifice and the continuing self-oblation of the heavenly High-priest, and his self-communication in the sacrament. Another hymn by Bright, "And now, O Father, mindful of the love" (302), treats more fully of the Act of Memorial.

---

[1] From the very valuable paper on "Magic and Sacraments" in *Theology* for December 1925, p. 338—a paper alluded to already in this book, p. 58. Cf. also Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 93 ff, and the relevant parts of *Essays Catholic and Critical*.

[2] *Contentio Veritatis* (1902), p. 307.

The change which has taken place in the Anglican church service since the days of the Oxford Movement forms the most remarkable chapter in the sacramental revival which is taking place in our day all over evangelical Christendom. In the ordinary popular accounts it is always the least essential features that are most widely advertised; and here public attention has been chiefly directed to the often extravagant ritualism. Usually it is not understood, either that this ritualism is only the outward expression of a revival of religion, or that the revival is by no means confined to the Anglo-Catholic party.

It would be out of place here to linger over the long series of ritual cases that came up for trial between 1855 and 1901, concerning the "legality" of such points as the eastward position, lights, crucifixes, the mixed chalice, the elevation, genuflection, vestments, incense.[1] Repeatedly priests were condemned to suspension, fines, and even imprisonment; and without doubt all parties, the accusers, the accused and the judges, showed a lamentable lack of wisdom.

Low-church persecutors scented popery in the most innocent things, and thereby conducted a most effective propaganda for all that they most desired to suppress; and they must, in fact, be held responsible in very large measure for the excesses to which the other side were driven.

The accused priests often showed a complete incapacity to discriminate the essential from the non-essential, and a very unclear idea of their responsibilities as priests of the Church of England. Frequently their devotional ideal was imported from Rome; and when it was necessary to decide what was to be regarded as truly "catholic," the papal church had sometimes higher authority for them than the church which they were pledged to serve. Yet at the same time these men frequently showed truly wonderful examples of unselfish devotion in the church's service, and some of them are almost saintly figures. Their success in building up a living Christianity in the most degraded slums forms one of the fairest pages in English church history. Their ritual excesses were but the expression of a longing desire for a form of worship which might embody a more whole-hearted devotion than the respectable and restrained forms of the traditional service. This longing could only find its satisfaction in the sacrament of the altar, in frequent communion and adoration of the Lord present in the sacrament. To show him the most boundless devotion became a religious duty, which only became more glorious when spiritual and civil powers in alliance sought to prevent it. Behind all the ritualistic paraphernalia, behind all the simple and uncritical imitation of the most un-catholic Roman innovations, lay this spontaneous, glowing devotion, which was and still is the strength of Anglo-Catholicism.

---

[1] See art. "Ritual Cases" in Ollard and Crosse, *Dictionary of English Church History*; and the relevant chapter of Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. II.

Finally, the judges themselves were not least to blame. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was usurping a spiritual authority to which it had no real right. Its judgments were often based on technicalities, unfair and inconsistent with one another, and hence provocative of opposition.

The result was chaos in the life of the church, and the total break-down of church discipline. The impossibility of the policy which had been followed was fully exposed by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, which sat between 1904 and 1906, and with praiseworthy wisdom and moderation assessed the variety of material brought before it. It disallowed many of the ceremonies of which complaint was made;[1] but it also justly condemned many of the accusations, pointing out the uncertainty of the law, especially in regard to the Ornaments Rubric, and showing that the high-churchmen were not the only transgressors of the law, and that, in fact, very many rubrics were habitually disregarded by low-churchmen. It summed matters up in the statement that " the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It needlessly condemns much which a great section of church people, including many of her most devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterised by a care for ceremonial and an appreciation of the continuity of the church which were not similarly felt at the time when the law took its present shape." [1] It asserted the impossibility of enforcing the law with the means available; and asked for fresh legislation, and more exercise of authority by the bishops in matters relating to public worship.

---

[1] Such as: Exposition, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, Corpus Christi processions, and mass without communicants. *Report.* p. 74.

All this was the result simply and solely of the extraordinary revival of sacramental religion. In the twenty years which have passed since that date the situation has cleared somewhat, and there is still hope that the church service may again be brought under canonical regulation, even though the great effort that was made to achieve this end in 1927 and 1928 was defeated by the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, twice over, by the House of Commons.

In order to form an estimate of the actual place of the eucharist in the life of the church in our own day, it is necessary to consider first the general Anglo-Catholic practice, without paying disproportionate attention to the peculiarities of the extreme section; and then to notice the importance of the change which has taken place in other sections of the church.

The first point to notice in a modern Anglo-Catholic church is the place of the sung mass. The chief Sunday service is a Eucharist, in which the Memorial-aspect is dominant. Mattins and Evensong, which form the prominent feature of the traditional Anglican service, as, for instance, in most of the cathedrals, are here relatively set on one side; particularly Mattins, the natural rival of the sung mass. Even if the Prayer Book rite is for the most part followed, with the addition, however, of prayers from other sources said by the celebrant, and of hymns at the place of the Gradual and Offertory, the outward setting is that of the Roman mass, unless indeed it is the still more imposing ceremonial of the English mediæval rite. The music is elaborate and well rendered; sometimes it is in the ascetical Gregorian manner, but more often modern melodies help to create a more spontaneous atmosphere of praise. The sermon takes an important place, but its length is necessarily limited. There is no communion of the people; the priest alone receives, and so the central point of the service comes to be the moment of consecration, which is emphasised by the elevation and the ringing of the bell. Thus the Roman type of service has here reappeared, to some extent as a result of direct imitation, but more of natural development; and the communion has in this service lost its place. But the sung mass is really and effectively the central point of the church's worship, and attracts large crowds; and even where the ceremonial is much more restrained, there is commonly a strong effort made to make a mass in some form the chief service of the day.

---

[1] P. 75.

Moderate Anglo-Catholics fully recognise the unsatisfactoriness of mass without communicants. "We must not be content," says Gore, "with restoring as our chief act of worship a service in which the communion of the people does not form an important part. It cannot be said too strongly that any practice which divorces eucharistic worship and sacrifice from communion, or which rests content at the 'high service' with the communion of the priest alone, really represents a seriously defective theology."[1] The common practice, however, is not the result of mere blind imitation of Roman usage, still less of lack of communicants; it is rather the result of the revival of the old rule of the fast before communion, with an energy which is typical of the great respect that is felt for every "catholic" practice, and is also the result of that same reverence for the eucharistic Mystery, out of which the rule originally grew. Since the fast is treated as obligatory,[2] the worshippers at the eleven o'clock mass must be content with "spiritual communion," and use the service as a focus for their devotion and their prayers. But it is deeply to be regretted that traditionalism together with the lack of a sense of proportion has prevented the restoration of the classical type of the primitive eucharist in all its harmonious beauty.

Instead, the communicants assemble at the early masses which are held every Sunday and week-day, usually more than one each day. The monthly paper of a typical church advertises mass at 7.15 and 8 each week-day, at 6.15, 7, and 8 on three holy-days occurring during the month, and on Sundays at 6.15, 7, 8, 9.45, and (the high mass) at 11. One would suspect that the number of pleadings of the sacrifice is multiplied for its own sake; but a study of the figures shows that at least on festivals the mere numbers of communicants are such as to necessitate several celebrations, and the very early masses are held for those whose work begins at an early hour. Where there are many who communicate often, the numbers of communicants reach a surprising figure.[1] There will be different opinions as to the healthiness of so advanced a sacramental practice; but it cannot be denied that the communion-aspect of the eucharist has here been developed as never before in any evangelical church—although not in connection with the solemn celebration. It may be stated with confidence that a more thorough investigation would show that there is rarely any sign of superstitious religion or justification by works; but simply a deep and earnest piety which finds its nourishment in the sacrament.

---

[1] *The Body of Christ*, p. 276. The tragedy of the divorce between the Sung Mass and communion is well brought out by Lacey, *The Anglo-Catholic Faith*, p. 154 ff.

[2] Cf. Knox, *The Catholic Movement*, p. 72 f.

Another feature of Anglo-Catholicism is the stress laid on the need of careful preparation for communion; this care for preparation is one side of reverence for the real presence. Special services of preparation are indeed rather the exception; but guidance is given in the devotional manuals, as by the provision of special prayers for every day of the week before communion.[2] It must also be remembered that private confession has again become a reality. As a rule it is not made obligatory, as in the Roman church, but it is very widely used as part of the preparation for communion.

Finally, it must be remembered that the reservation of the consecrated host has become increasingly common. This is usually justified by the need of the communion of the sick, which is thus usually no longer provided for by a celebration in the sick-room; and here it is possible to point to the usage of the early church.[3] In practice, however, reservation is associated with prayer and devotion before the sacrament, even when there are no processions of the sacrament or special services in its honour. No ritual question is the subject of more lively debate at the present time.[4] In the Revised Prayer Book reservation is permitted for the sake

[1] The following figures relate to the church alluded to in this paragraph: On an ordinary Sunday in November 1923 there were 19 communicants at 6.15, 80 at 7, 154 at 8, 2 at 9.45, and 2 at the high mass at 11. On the Monday morning there were 14 at 7.15, 11 at 8; total for the week, 435. On Christmas Day, 677.

[2] *E.g.* Wilson, *Before the Altar*, pp. 30–43. On preparation in general, see Newbolt, *The Sacrament of the Altar*, Chaps. V and VI.

[3] Knox, p. 73.

[4] See the highly illuminating report of the Conference held at Farnham Castle in 1926, entitled *Reservation* (ed: Woods).

of the communion of the sick, but not for other purposes; and this provision was accepted both by the Bishops, and by the representatives of the clergy and laity in the Convocations and the Church Assembly, but was the main cause of the rejection of the Book by the House of Commons. It is not our business here to pass a general judgment on the practice of reservation; this is a matter which certainly causes a Lutheran observer some perplexity. But we may perhaps point out that it involves peculiar dangers, particularly when connected with special forms of devotion. These specialised forms of piety threaten the balance of the eucharist; and usages which in themselves are patient of an intelligent interpretation may easily be misunderstood by simpler minds, and so treated as to involve what we have called above a "paganising" of Christian worship.

To some the picture which we have drawn will seem almost terrifying. But however much judgments may differ, the fact of the Anglican revival is the supreme witness in modern church history to the religious power, the inexhaustible vitality of the central rite of Christian worship; and it proves that this rite, even when long neglected or suppressed, is able to rise up again and claim its due place as the focussing point of spiritual communion with God in the institutional church.

It is much easier to measure the special features of the Anglo-Catholic movement, and its excesses, than its indirect influence on other parts of the church. Throughout the whole Church of England the place of the eucharist has undergone a profound change, even in the low-church section, where it is often celebrated in the evening—a point which the high-church insistence on the fast before communion has made into a party-badge. In most places the celebration of the eucharist once a week, besides the appointed holy-days, is regarded as a minimum standard, to fall below which would be a mark of slackness. A hundred years ago such a standard was a rarely-attained maximum.

Step by step the eucharist is making its way to the central place in the worship of the church, even where the chief Sunday service is Mattins, as it is still in the majority of churches. And with the general increase in the frequency of communion, the idea of the three communions a year as the rule of formal church observance is dropping out of sight. At the same time it needs to be remembered, whenever comparison is made of church statistics, that the Church of England regards as communicants only those who receive three times yearly, of which Easter is one.[1] Finally, we may note the central importance which attaches to communion as the symbol of church unity in the discussions on Reunion, which have been the subject of lively interest in the Church of England in recent years, and of which the only result actually achieved is the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 in favour of intercommunion with the Church of Sweden, and the reply of the Swedish bishops.[1]

---

[1] The *Official Year-Book of the Church of England* gives the figure of 315,495 communicants on Easter Day 1924, and 128,988 more in Easter week.

On the other hand, the place which the eucharist has come to occupy in the centre of their religious life has made Anglicans of the "catholic" type very unwilling to take part in "mixed" celebrations where Christians of different denominations meet at the Lord's Table. Thus Anglo-Catholicism, which has done so much to stimulate the desire for the organic reunion of Christendom, has seemed to many to present one of the chief obstacles to its consummation. But it may also be true that it has helped to prevent premature attempts to conceal real divergences in matters much more fundamental than forms of order and ritual; and indeed a similar position has been adopted, on doctrinal grounds, by rigid Lutheranism.

It is not our task—and it would indeed be presumptuous—to pass a verdict on the question of the revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*, which has been in recent years the centre of controversy in the Church of England. To the liturgical student both the previous proposals and the new Prayer Book are of the greatest interest. The "green" and the "grey" books contained much material, with regard both to the mass and to other offices, that ought not to fall into oblivion, and will be of value for constructive liturgical work also in other communions. The restoration of the dislocated canon to its original unity—a common feature of most of the proposed forms and of the new Book itself, must be regarded as a great gain. And in spite of the criticisms of the Canon of the new Prayer Book, which have been made by some of the most eminent of English liturgical scholars, the foreign observer may be allowed to express the opinion that if it should come into general and authorised use, the Church of England will possess one of the noblest of all evangelical eucharistic liturgies.

---

[1] *Lambeth Conference Report*, 1920, pp. 33, 152-4. Reply of the Swedish bishops, in Bell, *Documents of Christian Unity*, pp. 185-95.

CHAPTER VII

THE SWEDISH CHURCH

1. Mediæval Sweden.

It can never be right to study the destructive and constructive work of the Reformation apart from its mediæval background. But the religious life of mediæval Sweden has not yet received adequate investigation. We have indeed Lindberg's important work on the missals;[1] but we are still waiting for the thorough study of mediæval statutes, patents and devotional writings which is essential if we are to enter into the thoughts and the religious experience of our forefathers at mass and at communion.

Yet mediæval religion was so far standardised that Sweden did not differ essentially from other European lands; and the documents show how here as elsewhere it was the duty of all Christians to hear mass every Sunday at least, to show fitting reverence to "God's body," and after penance and absolution to receive communion every Easter, and if possible before death. Here also mass without communicants was the chief Sunday service; and we have a number of expositions of the mass which show how even this service could serve to set forth the love of God and the forgiveness of sin. A widely-used devotional manual, *The Consolation of the Soul* (Själens tröst), contains an account of the service, describing the times for sitting, kneeling and standing; evidently the moment in the Creed when all knelt for the *Et incarnatus* was deeply impressive. There is no mention of a sermon, but there was a collection, evidently not only of money but also of gifts in kind. At the Offertory a rhymed prayer is given :

"O most blessed Lord Jesus Christ,
Thou art in heaven our great High-priest,
Thou didst this Sacrament first ordain,
At the Supper before that thou wast slain,
Help the priest to celebrate aright,
To thy glory and for our benefit,
And that help to the tortured souls may come,
Whom thou hast saved from endless doom."

---

[1] *Die schwedischen Missalien des Mittelalters*, Uppsala, 1923.

At the elevation a prayer might be said to the body of Christ,

"Which now I see in the priest's hands,
Loose me from all my sins' hard bands,
O glorious King, O living Bread,
Be thou my help in my utmost need."

It is likely that in that day as in this the religious depth of the eucharist was more felt in the simplicity of the country church than in the splendour of the cathedral service. It seems that in Sweden as in Germany there was a considerable variety of devotional books, which made the drama of the liturgy into a spiritual exercise and a means of edification.

We hear of two solemn masses, *Missa matutinalis* and *Summa missa*, at Uppsala Cathedral in 1298; besides these, there were, of course, the many votive and other private masses at the side altars, and this abuse had become highly developed in Sweden by the beginning of the sixteenth century. The missals show how mass was offered for temporal needs, such as for rain, for the harvest, for a safe journey, against cattle disease and so on. Even a century earlier it had been impossible to find time in winter for all the masses which were to be said between dawn and midday, and a Papal dispensation was sought for the celebration of mass before sunrise.

It is not easy to say whether it was the eucharistic sacrifice or the real presence in the host which held the central place in popular piety. Certainly the holiness of the consecrated host is the basis of a variety of legends; and in 1419 we hear of Exposition of the Sacrament in the City Church, St. Nicholas, at Stockholm (Storkyrkan) for the benefit of sailors, and processions with the host were certainly not unknown. It was the duty of the parish priest to reserve the sacrament for the communion of the sick. A number of passages from the devotional books show how "God's Body" was the object of devotion; and some of the prayers of the nuns of Vadstena[1] allow us to see how the real presence in the elements can minister to devotion: "O Lord God, who art my Creator and my Redeemer, I pray thee; as this which was bread is now turned into Thy holy Body, and as this which was wine and water is now turned into holy Blood, so turn my heart away from all that is contrary to thee, and make it ready to do all thy will, so that I may love thee above all things, and do thy holy will so long as I live." Some of these prayers might serve the needs of the present-day communicant. In them a burning love for Jesus is united with holy awe and a deep sense of sin; and even when sacrifice and works are mentioned, it is always with the sense of unmerited grace.

---

[1] Vadstena, on Lake Vättern, was the mother-house of the Swedish community founded by St. Birgitta in 1344. See Wordsworth, *The National Church of Sweden* (Hale Lectures, 1910), pp. 122–43.

Outside the monasteries there is little direct evidence of the place of communion in the spiritual life of the people. Sermons on the mass treated generally of the miracle of the presence and the reverence due to the host; and this subject is sometimes treated by means of parables and images, such as the following passage, about the possibility of the infinite God being present in a little piece of bread: "This may be understood by a parable: As you, a man, can with your little eye see far away over the sea, and embrace in your glance all that wide-stretching space, so can God the all-powerful, who has created the sea and the eye and all things, be with all the grace and power of his Godhead, true God, in the little wafer which the priest gives you with his hand. And though some wonder how the one God's body can be in many priest's hands in all Christendom, this may be likewise declared by a parable: as that a great mirror were broken into many small pieces, and in each little piece a man may see himself reflected, and behold his face as perfectly as in the whole great mirror; so is God's body in many small wafers, true God; and into however many pieces it may be divided, yet God's body is no less perfectly received in every piece."

It is certain that though relatively frequent communion was common in the monasteries, the usual observance among the laity was limited to the Easter communion, with confession and penance during Lent for preparation; but it was insisted that this was only a minimum standard. The Easter communion was for the individual both a right and a duty, and it was associated with the payment of church dues. At Easter the rector and churchwardens made up their accounts, and anyone who had failed to pay his tithe could expect to be refused his Easter communion; if he died, his body would not be buried in consecrated ground till the debt had been paid by his heirs. In Sweden, as elsewhere, this legal obligation must have seriously damaged the religious idea of the sacrament in the minds of the people; in any case communion received at such rare intervals can hardly have been thought of as the great means of grace.

Perhaps the communion of the sick had a deeper religious character than the Easter communion, though it can hardly fail to have been regarded in a superstitious way.

But there is one point on which I have never been able to find in our sources any information at all: the fast before communion It can hardly be doubted that the ancient rule, backed by canonical authority since the Council of Constance, was at least theoretically valid also in Sweden. It is another question whether it was even possible for it to be observed in the large country parishes, where long distances had to be traversed on the way to church.

It was then the Memorial-aspect of the eucharist that was most prominent in mediæval Sweden. We do well to abstain from indiscriminate condemnation; but it can hardly be denied that the disuse of communion involved a disastrous narrowing of the idea of the sacrament, and an exaggeration of one aspect at the cost of the rest. The Reformation was to bring a revival, as of religion in general, so also of sacramental life.

2. The Eucharistic Teaching of Olaus Petri.

It was in 1527, in his polemical reply to the Danish humanist Paulus Eliæ, the *Answer to an Unchristian Letter*, that Olaus Petri's ideas about the eucharist first found expression. Here then we have yet another case of a Reformer whose sacramental ideas first took shape in controversy; we shall not therefore expect to find in this writing his best and deepest thoughts. Since it is his part here to champion Luther, it is naturally Luther's anti-Roman polemic that he chiefly reproduces. "Luther," he says, "sternly condemns the misuse of the sacrament of Christ's precious body and blood, that it is not so used as Christ instituted and ordained; hence he condemns not the mass in itself, which is unspeakably good when used aright." But the right use of the mass consists only in the partaking of Christ's body and blood "in remembrance of him, so that so oft as this is done, the death of the Lord is preached and proclaimed, how that he has offered himself on the cross to our heavenly Father for us, and by that sacrifice propitiated him whom we had offended, and shed his precious blood whereby he has washed away our sins."

Here as in other places, where Olaus Petri speaks of "preaching" in connection with the sacrament, it is unnecessary to infer that he meant that a sermon ought always to be preached at the mass; for it was equally important to make the mass itself a proclamation of the gospel of redemption, particularly by the use of the vernacular. Certainly the idea in this passage, as in Luther,[1] is that the sacrament itself is a proclamation of the Gospel; Christ gave us " his body and blood as a sign or pledge that we might receive them and thereby assure our conscience that our sins are indeed forgiven." This explanation suffers from the same weakness as that of Luther. It should naturally lead to a strong emphasis on the Memorial-aspect of the rite; but since this road was blocked for the Reformers by their protest against the abuse of the sacrificial idea, they had to make an unnatural connection with the act of communion, and by treating the gift in communion as the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, make communion an unnecessary reinforcement of absolution. The negative condemnation of the most flagrant abuses, such as the withdrawal of the chalice, mass without communicants, and payment for votive masses, is almost taken for granted, and is not developed in any detail.

In his *Answers to Twelve Questions* (also 1527) the clash of ideas in this early phase of the Reformation is clearly shown. This treatise is a dialogue with Peder Galle, a member of the theological faculty of Uppsala, and the best contemporary Swedish representative of scholastic theology. On the question of the functions of priesthood Olaus Petri comes very near to the position of the " spiritualising " reformers; but on the subject of the right use of the mass he can almost agree in principle, and is able to point out triumphantly that " Doctor Peder's answer and conclusion condemns all the prebends that are founded on the saying of masses."

The ideas of Luther's writings of the period after 1520 meet us again in the *Christian Exhortation to the Clergy*, where he stresses the importance of preaching, even at the expense of the sacrament. The administration of the sacraments belongs indeed to the priesthood, but " This is a small matter compared with preaching; without preaching sacraments are of little use, since then men understand not why they should use the sacraments, or how they help us, if they be not preached and explained for us; sacraments are indeed but an assurance and pledge, whereby we know that those benefits of which the sermon speaks are given to us; just as with a letter, when a seal is impressed upon it, we are assured of the validity of that which is written in the letter. But if it be so that a man seals a letter wherein nothing is written, then the seal is vain and does not accomplish that end for which it was intended. So is it with the sacraments when preaching is absent."

---

[1] *Sermon vom neuen Testament*, and *De captivitate babylonica*. Cf. pp. 100–103 above.

The *Little Book on the Sacraments* (1528) can hardly be said to mark an advance on what we have already seen; but it contains some interesting passages. He urges that for the sick the sacrament should not be reserved but should be consecrated in the sick man's presence, that his faith may be strengthened "not only by the sign but also by Christ's word." He criticises Exposition and processions of the host, because external honour is paid at the cost of inward devotion; God can be worshipped "not only in church or at a procession, or at mass, near to the sacrament, or before the monstrance; but at all times and in all places, in church or outside, in the fields or at home, as Christ said to the Samaritan woman . . . Since now it is not by God's command that the sacrament is set in a monstrance, or carried in procession, but this is to misuse the sacrament, therefore every man may understand that so more dishonour than honour is paid to God; and Christ is not present in the sacrament in order that he may there be adored or carried hither and thither, but that he may come to us and help us when we receive his body and blood for a sign or pledge of the forgiveness of sins; just as it was for this that he came into the world, not that he might be adored, but that he might help us. . . . Therefore the true honour is paid to Christ when we receive his testament in a true faith; and this is done when we put our whole trust in his word, that his holy body and blood are given for the forgiveness of our sins; and then the sacrament is set in its true monstrance, for it is our heart that is in truth God's temple. . . ."

There are here a healthy freshness and a spirituality which make the prayers of the nuns of Vadstena seem by comparison like hothouse plants. Nevertheless, the idea of the Testament which is here set forth by no means represents the best in Olaus Petri, any more than in Luther. Luther went on in his later period to a mystical sacramentalism; but strangely enough, Olaus Petri seems to have been quite uninfluenced by this teaching, and went back instead for his positive teaching to the ideas of Luther's earliest writings. So in his book of Homilies (*En nyttog postilla*) of 1528, which for the most part reproduces Luther, the mystical communion-fellowship of Paul, the *Didache*, and Augustine finds expression, probably for the first time in the Swedish language, in a manner which makes this sermon worthy to be regarded as one of the classics of the Swedish church.

He plays on the two meanings of " the body of Christ ": " The second fruit of communion is that we become together one bread and one cup. How comes it that we all become one bread, and consume that which is ourselves? Thus: when I consume this sacrament, it consumes me; outwardly I consume the sacrament, but inwardly and spiritually I receive Christ and all that is his. When I consume a material piece of bread, my body is strengthened thereby; on the contrary, when I receive the sacrament, then Christ receives me, and consumes me and my sins, and I become partaker of his righteousness, and his faithfulness and goodness swallow up me and my sins, so that then I have naught else but righteousness.

" So it is also with us, that we are all one bread, and consume one another. Thou knowest well that when one bakes bread, he grinds up all the grains of wheat, and so each separate grain goes to make the flour composed of all the grains, and they all are so mingled one with another that none retains its own form, but one flour is made of them all, and each grain loses its own body, so that of the bodies of all the grains is made one body of the bread. So it is too when one makes wine; then each grape mingles its juice with the juice of the other grapes, and one wine is made of all the grapes. So it is with us . . . . If I am a sinner, and thou by God's grace art good and righteous, then thou comest and sharest thy goodness with me, and prayest for me, and goest forward before God and takest my burden on thee as though it were thy own, and so with thy goodness thou dost consume my sins, even as Christ has done for us, and so thou consumest me and I consume thee again.

" Here then thou seest what a mighty and unspeakable thing it is with this sacrament, when it is rightly used, for it far, far surpasses our human understanding; or is it not a great thing that God in his eternal majesty comes here and becomes mine? And that all God's saints should come to me and take my burden upon them, having a care for me, and helping me and ministering to me as though my burden were theirs? So God makes us partakers with Christ and with all his elect saints. Here we have a confidence whereon we may surely trust. Am I now a sinner? Christ stands over me and says, This sinner is mine, I take him under my protection. Who will murmur at these things? And so my sins are abolished, and I am partaker of his righteousness. So also we Christians do one with another; the one takes the other's burden upon him, the one bears the other's sin and weakness and ministers to him with his righteousness and goodness. . . ."

This is from the Easter sermon; the following sermon speaks of preparation for communion. Faith is indeed necessary, and he who comes not in a right faith had better stay away; but the sense of unworthiness must not keep anyone away from the sacrament. "For thou must not make Christ into a tyrant, but let him be what in truth he is, full to overflowing of grace and mercy." "For it is of the true nature of faith that she is exercised and showeth her power in the midst of fearing, of sin and death, and all that can make men terrified, frightened and despairing. Therefore, though thou be ever so frightened and full of fear, then is the time to go to the sacrament, then thy faith shall get something to do." So too private confession is useful for a good preparation.

In all this Olaus Petri is acting more or less directly as Luther's interpreter. But when he is not consciously following Luther he expresses similar thoughts. So in a little catechism at the end of his own book of sermons (*Een lijten postilla*): "When we set our faith on this, that he has given himself up to death and shed his precious blood for us, that we might be freed from sins and have eternal life in him, then through this faith we are united with him, and so we eat his body spiritually and drink his blood, and he comes to be in us and we in him, so that we are one body with him. He is the Head and we the members, and from him we have defence against all our enemies."

Olaus Petri never climbed the heights of Luther's sacramental teaching; but for this reason he escaped the danger of a narrow localising of the real presence, which beset Luther as much as the men of the Middle Ages. Speculation about the mystery of the presence seems to have been alien to the mind of the Swedish Reformer; nor was he faced with the necessity of defining his position against an extreme Protestant wing. Consequently, when he needed a deeper view of the sacrament than that which the idea of the Testament afforded, he found it in the mystery of communion-fellowship rather than in Luther's speculations about the real presence and his doctrine of Ubiquity. Yet in result the actual development of the evangelical liturgy in Sweden was little affected by this difference.

Additional Note on the History of the Swedish Reformation.

The Reformation in Sweden was closely connected with the winning of national independence and the rise of modern Sweden. The union with Denmark, which was favoured by the nobility and the higher clergy, had at times come to mean the domination of a foreign ruler. In the perpetual conflict between the unionist and the national parties, both sides had sought the help of the Papacy. But when in 1520 King Christian II of Denmark endeavoured to subdue Sweden under his rule, he could claim to be the executor of Papal sentences against the national leaders, on the ground of violent measures used against the unionist Archbishop of Uppsala. His attempt to terrorise the people by the so-called Blood-bath of Stockholm (November 8, 1520) resulted in the rising of Gustav Vasa and the War of Independence; and as the Pope insisted on the restitution of the archbishop, the rebellion gained also an ecclesiastical significance. The short-sighted policy of the Curia made the breach with Rome almost a political necessity for the national monarchy, which was re-established by the election of Gustav Vasa as king at the *Riksdag of Strängnäs* in 1523.

Two other influences made this development inevitable: an empty treasury, and the ideas of the Lutheran Reformation, which were first propagated by two clerks whom the king came to know at Strängnäs—the young deacon Olaus Petri, the greatest spiritual force in the Swedish Reformation, and the archdeacon Laurentius Andreæ, who during the critical years inspired the king's ecclesiastical policy. Laurentius Petri, the younger brother of Olaus, became the first Lutheran Archbishop of Uppsala in 1531, and during forty-two years of office guided the development, especially in liturgical matters, on conservative lines.

At the *Riksdag of Västerås* in 1527 the king received authority to use the "superfluous" wealth of bishops, chapters and monasteries for the benefit of the Crown. At the same time permission was given for the free preaching of the Gospel. This, of course, resulted in a final breach with Rome; and the Reformation made steady, if slow, progress under royal protection. But the development of a free national church, which seems to have been the ideal of the Reformers, was threatened by the king's violent assertion of his supremacy; and the influence of German precedents and of German counsellors seemed likely at one time to bring about a breach of continuity with the mediæval church, through the abolition of episcopacy and the introduction of a system of government on continental lines. But this only lasted for a short time, and in fact the line of Archbishops of Uppsala has been continuous from the consecration of the Cistercian Stephen in 1164 to the present day.

Gustav Vasa died in 1560. During the reign of his eldest son, Erik XIV (1560–68), a certain amount of Calvinistic influence is discernible; but the reign of his second son, John III (1568–92), is notable for his attempt to establish a Swedish *via media* on patristic lines. But the evident Roman influence in the king's ecclesiastical views, as well as his suspected negotiations with the Papacy, called forth a strong reaction; and his son Sigismund, who had been educated as a Roman Catholic, attempted to join the crown of Sweden to that of Poland. On the other hand, Duke Charles (the youngest son of Gustav Vasa, who later became King Charles IX, and was the father of Gustavus Adolphus) had Calvinistic leanings; it was he who headed the national and Protestant opposition to the king, and finally ousted him from the throne.

These opposite dangers drove the Swedish church to seal its Lutheran allegiance by the formal acceptance of the Confession of Augsburg, at the *Uppsala-möte* in 1593. In maintaining its spiritual independence at this critical time, the Swedish church set an inspiring and fruitful example to future generations.

3. The Swedish Mass of Olaus Petri.

The first Swedish mass was issued by Olaus Petri in 1531; and the key to its peculiarities is, as I shall hope to show, that it was not, like the Anglican rites, intended to take the place of the old high mass, but was designed as a communion-mass, to be used for the time being side by side with the Latin mass, which in fact continued to be celebrated in Sweden for several years.

It is usually believed, on the authority of Messenius' rhyme-chronicle of Stockholm, that mass was first celebrated in Swedish at the wedding of Olaus Petri on February 11, 1525.[1] The rhyme has been translated thus: [2]

> "On Master Olof's wedding day
> Our Lutherdom had made such sway
> That mass in Swedish first was sung,
> So all men followed their own tongue.
> For so had Master Olof seen
> How things at Wittenberg had been.
> There first at Carlstadt's wedding-feast
> Was German mass said by a priest."

But it is certain that the last two lines are in error. We know that Carlstadt's wedding did not take place till January 19, 1522, that is, after his famous mass on Christmas Day; and even then only the words of institution were in German.[3] The fact that Messenius is here demonstrably in error does not increase our confidence in his information about the circumstances of Olaus Petri's wedding.

The state of the Swedish Reformation at the time makes it in the last degree unlikely that mass was said in Swedish so early; before any literature had appeared; four years before we know from other sources that a Swedish mass was used in any form; six years before the Swedish mass was published; before Luther's German mass had appeared; and before Olaus Petri could have seen the Nuremberg mass, which was beyond doubt a principal source of his Swedish mass. Nor is it likely that such an event would have escaped the notice of contemporaries, especially Olaus Petri's critic, Bishop Brask, and have been first brought to light by Messenius a century later. For these reasons we must dismiss the idea that mass was said in Swedish in 1525.

---

[1] So Wordsworth, *The National Church of Sweden*, p. 213 f., following Quensel. The date of Messenius is 1579–1636 (Wordsworth, p. 277).

[2] Translation from Wordsworth, p. 216.

[3] P. 111 above.

In these early years it is clear from the somewhat scanty evidence that the main effort of the reforming party was to encourage preaching. In the *Ordinance of Västerås* (1527) no liturgical change was ordered; for the preaching of the Gospel, which was enjoined, could be carried out within the order of the old service. Olaus Petri's Homilies were published in order to help forward this movement. Similarly the *Ordinance of Skara* (1529) imposed on the clergy the duty of preaching every Sunday and holy-day. It is true that in this year there were popular movements of protest against liturgical changes in Småland and Västergötland, which found expression at the Riksdag at Strängnäs in June: "his grace," (*i.e.*, the king), they said, "has had the mass changed to the Swedish tongue." It is in every way probable that by this time the first tentative beginnings were being made towards the creation of a Swedish mass in Stockholm and other towns; and that it was the rumour of this that aroused the fears of the countrymen. The king explained that he had in this matter issued neither command nor prohibition, but had allowed that which was being done to continue, since it could be defended by God's word, over which he had no power; and that the same things were being done in Germany, Denmark, Holstein and other lands. Also the Latin mass was not laid aside but still continued.

Certainly the king went forward very cautiously; that this was a deliberate policy may be inferred from the fact that the Council of Örebro, which he called for February, 1529, consisted largely of supporters of the old order, and adherents of a mediating policy, more or less under the influence of the school of Erasmus. The remarkable fact is that at this Council no resolutions were passed forbidding the customary forms of worship. Bishops were permitted to abolish certain holy-days, and certain ceremonies received an evangelical interpretation; but the chief interest of the Council was to set forward the preaching of God's word. Every parish priest was to preach, and at least in the cathedrals there was to be " a daily lesson from the holy scriptures with good and intelligent explanation thereof," whereat the cathedral clergy and those from the neighbourhood should receive instruction in God's word; and similarly in schools; therefore learned priests should be stationed in the towns and at the schools. The Lord's Prayer, Creed and *Ave Maria* were to be repeated at every sermon in the parish churches, and the Ten Commandments once or twice a month.[1]

It has been suggested that all this refers to the daily instruction, but it seems to me evident that there is reference also to the sermons which were to be preached at the Sunday mass. Olaus Petri's *Postils* also were intended to help the " simple clerks " who " had complained that they could not well use the plain texts in the Gospel, and make from them a sermon for their people "; and as the service to which the old-fashioned people in the country were accustomed to come was and continued to be the Latin mass, there can be no doubt that this would be the service at which the sermons in question were to be preached. There was indeed no other way in which the country people could be given the Gospel. Nor is there any reason to suppose otherwise than that the sermon was given in the usual place, after the Creed. Such a supposition fits in best with the rubrical directions of the *Little Postil*, where we also find a form of confession and absolution to be used after the sermon, together with the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the *Our Father*, and the *Hail Mary*—an act closely corresponding with the " offene Schuld " of mediæval German practice. This Confession and Absolution was intended, originally at least, to supplement, not to supersede, private Confession.

This gives us the background against which we are to see the development of the Swedish mass. The first liturgical form to be published was Olaus Petri's *Handbook* (Handbock påå Swensko) of 1529, which contained forms for baptism, marriage, churching of women, visitation and communion of the sick, burial of the dead, and visitation of prisoners.[2] In the form for the communion of the sick there is, after the sick man's confession, a long exhortation about communion; the sick man is asked whether he believes all the articles of the Christian faith; then the priest reads " the Epistle," the Pauline account of the institution, and then the Synoptic version of the same, in a harmonised form. There is no act of consecration, and, as Quensel points out, the use of the reserved sacrament is probably presupposed, even though elsewhere Olaus Petri pleads for a celebration of the eucharist in the sick-room. The communion follows, and then a prayer about the forgiveness of sins, and help and consolation in sickness. Extreme unction may follow. We have then here not a liturgy in the proper sense, but only the first beginnings of an evangelical communion-rite.

---

[1] Cf. Wordsworth, p. 204.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 209 f.

In the same year Olaus Petri also published a little book, *Reasons why Mass ought to be celebrated in the language which is understood by the Common Man*, with the object of justifying the introduction of the Swedish mass; for it is probable that the service which was published in 1531 was in use for a year or two before. Here he strongly emphasises the importance of communion, and also of preaching as a necessary complement to the mass; but at the same time we must remember that in his view—as he says in so many words in this book—" this most honourable sacrament is in a measure itself a sermon "; the mass, with the words of institution in Swedish and an exhortation about communion, was itself a proclamation of Christ's death and the forgiveness of sins. His constant principle is " The Lord's Supper and God's word must go together." It is evident from his words that the form of mass commonly in use was the Latin.

The Swedish Mass, as it is now celebrated in Stockholm, with Reasons why it should be so celebrated, appeared in 1531. The preface gives a fancy picture of the simple eucharist of the primitive church, as was usual at this period. Olaus Petri sees clearly enough that the Roman canon is an incoherent piece of patchwork, but he does not, like Luther, indulge in violent condemnation of it; indeed, under the circumstances, he could not. Again, he has a clear idea of the difference between the Roman and other ancient liturgical types: " the Mass was not always celebrated in the whole of Christendom, nor is it now celebrated after one manner in all countries; for the Latins have their manner, the Greeks theirs, they of Asia, Armenia, Chaldæa, India, Abyssinia theirs; and even the Latins themselves have not one manner only, for they of Rome have their manner and they of Milan theirs, nor have the secular clerks altogether the same manner as the regulars." Yet he had no direct knowledge of any ancient rite, and so was no better able than Luther to create an evangelical liturgy out of ancient non-Roman material. Perhaps too the gift of creative liturgical talent was not his in any high degree. His mass is mainly a compilation, but he shows good taste in the choice of his exemplars and his usual mastery of style.

The first Swedish mass follows the type of the *Formula Missæ*;[1] but there are good reasons for believing that his nearest exemplar is the rite compiled by Döber for the hospital at Nuremberg, and published in 1525.[2] As in this rite, the priest's preparation at the altar is replaced by a general confession and absolution, and preceded by an invitation. The Confession itself—" I, poor sinful man . . ." —has remained substantially unaltered in the Swedish mass to this day.[3] An introit follows, which may be a psalm; but while Döber prefers a psalm of praise such as the 103rd, Olaus Petri suggests one of the seven penitential psalms. Then comes the threefold *Kyrie* in Swedish, *Gloria in excelsis*, salutation, collect, epistle, gradual (" the hymn about God's commandments, or some other "), gospel. It appears, however, at this point that Olaus Petri intended to break with the liturgical year; one invariable collect is given in the text;[4] the usual system of lections may be read, but he prefers that the Epistles and Gospels should be read consecutively, a chapter or half a chapter each day. It was not till 1537 that the Swedish mass contained full provision for *de tempore* variations. After the Gospel, the Apostles' Creed, as in Döber, is given as an alternative to the Nicene, and the former only is printed.

No mention whatever is made of a sermon; the *Sursum corda* and Preface follow immediately. The text of the latter is as follows: " It is verily meet, right, and blessed that we should in all places give thanks unto thee, holy Lord, almighty Father, everlasting God, for all thy benefits, and especially for that which thou didst unto us, when we all for our sins' sake were in so evil a case that naught but damnation and eternal death awaited us, and no creature either in heaven or on earth could help us; then thou didst send forth thine only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, who was of one divine nature with thyself, to become man for our sake, didst lay our sins upon him, and let him undergo death for us that we might not die eternally; and as he overcame death and rose again unto life, and now dieth no more, so likewise shall all they who put their trust therein overcome sins and death, and through him attain to everlasting life; and for our admonition, that we should keep in mind and never forget this his benefit, in the night that he was betrayed. . . ." Here follow, as in *Formula Missæ* and Döber, the words of institution, accompanied by the elevation; then the *Sanctus*, with *Hosanna* and *Benedictus*; then the Lord's Prayer, with the introduction which is still in use: "Let us all now pray as our Lord Jesus Christ himself hath taught us, saying thus—"

---

[1] Olaus Petri's mass is printed, with an English translation, in Yelverton, *The Mass in Sweden* (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1919). The same volume contains the *ordinarium missæ* of the mediæval Swedish rite, other documents of the Swedish Reformation, and the modern Swedish liturgy.

[2] Valuable light is thrown on the connections between the Swedish Reformers and Nuremberg by C. Bergendoff, a theologian of the Swedish Lutheran church in America, in his careful study, *Olaus Petri and The Ecclesiastical Transformation in Sweden* (New York, 1928).

[3] See p. 266 below.

[4] Sixteen others, translated from the missal, but not allocated to special days, are printed at the end.

Thus Olaus Petri's preface follows the pattern of the *Formula Missæ* and of Döber in missing its natural climax in the *Sanctus*. But in other ways it raises problems which have never yet received adequate consideration. While both Luther and Döber reproduce the first part of the Latin *præfatio de communi*, Olaus Petri's preface is much longer. In part it shows originality, as in the inclusion of the Incarnation in the thanksgiving; but in the latter part it passes from the thought of the death and the atoning sacrifice of Christ to that of his Resurrection, and I would suggest that it is based, as regards its general idea rather than its wording, on the Latin Paschal Preface. But the ideas which the Latin form expresses with the solemn and dignified brevity of the Roman style appear in Olaus Petri in a somewhat didactic manner, with more emphasis on sin and forgiveness. It is interesting to note that the revision of 1894 goes back quite definitely to this source, in the words "He is our Paschal Lamb."[1] The bearings of this will appear later.

After the Lord's Prayer comes the *Pax*, as in the *Formula Missæ*, then the threefold *Agnus*. Then, as at Nuremberg, a fairly long exhortation about communion; surely most inappropriate at this point. This exhortation, with its strongly penitential character, remained in the Swedish mass till 1894, and without doubt had a deep influence in forming the common Swedish conception of the meaning of Holy Communion. The words of administration follow the Roman form: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life," and similarly for the chalice; the Uppsala Missal and the *Handbook* of 1529 read "preserve thy body and soul." During the communion a psalm might be read or sung, or (as at Nuremberg) the *Nunc Dimittis*. The service ends with the salutation, a fixed post-communion collect, the salutation, *Benedicamus Domino*, and the Aaronic blessing.

---

[1] See p. 268 below.

Two circumstances have particularly attracted the attention of commentators on this rite: the absence of any reference to a sermon, and the small place given to singing. As for the former of these, it has commonly been held that a sermon was to precede the service, on the strength of the oft-quoted words, "There shall be no mass unless a sermon have preceded." I have already tried to show that it is easy to make too much of these words; that the sermons in the *Little Postil* of 1529 were intended to be inserted in the Latin mass; and that the celebration of the mass in Swedish, with the exhortation before communion, may have satisfied Olaus Petri's requirements. It seems to me, therefore, likely that the Swedish mass was sometimes celebrated without a sermon.

As regards the second point, it is explicitly said that the Gradual, *Sanctus*, *Agnus*, and Communio may be either said or sung, and the same may be inferred of the Introit. Now we know too little of the exact usage of the late mediæval period to be able to say precisely how such rubrics would stand in relation to common practice; was there, for instance, then in existence such a compromise between high and low mass as the modern *Missa Cantata*? In any case it is evident that Olaus Petri's mass was for the most part to be said, not sung; and also that this was in no way a matter of principle with him, as it was with Zwingli.

It has been commonly taken for granted that this Swedish mass was intended to take the place of the old high mass. In this case it was a very radical change indeed that was being introduced; all the splendid ceremonial of the old rite would have disappeared at a blow, and the magnificent spectacle which was the chief religious event of the week would have been suddenly replaced with an outwardly simple service. But we know that as a matter of fact the Latin and the Swedish mass continued to exist side by side during the period after 1529.

Let us look at the state of affairs at Nuremberg, from which Olaus Petri took the model for his rite. If much is uncertain, at least it is clear that the public service was at this time a modified Latin mass, while Döber's mass was celebrated wholly in German in the Hospital chapel; and this service was, as its whole construction shows, intended to meet the needs of those who desired an evangelical communion-rite. It replaced, therefore, not a high mass, but a "low" communion-mass. Is it not likely that precisely the same explanation holds good of St. Nicholas' Church at Stockholm in Olaus Petri's day? The first Swedish mass was designed to take the place of the low mass at which people made their communion, not the high mass; and perhaps the cause of the Reformation was best served by leaving this undisturbed, with the introduction only of a regular sermon.

It seems to me that this explanation makes the course of the Swedish Reformation a great deal more intelligible; the first Swedish mass was then just one step in advance from the form for the communion of the sick in the Handbook; it provided an evangelical communion-service, while the unenlightened multitude still had the Latin high mass. It explains why the service is predominantly a said mass; it took the place of a Latin said mass. It explains the absence of a sermon. It explains also, perhaps, why Olaus Petri went for his model to far-away Nuremberg; that was the one place where a parallel was known to exist to the precise form of service which he had in mind. If I am right in my contention that Olaus Petri's preface is partly based on the Latin Paschal preface, this point also is readily explicable if the service was originally written for use at the great communion-festival of Easter. Finally, the rubric at the beginning, which reads "When the priest and people are assembled in the church or before the altar where mass is to be celebrated," is not intelligible if the service were the chief Sunday service, which would always be held at the high altar; but it becomes clear at once when it is seen to relate to a said communion-mass, which in a church with many altars would often be in a side-chapel.

4. The advance of the Swedish Mass, from 1531 to 1552.

The next stage in the development of the Swedish mass consists in its gradual advance to take the place of the Latin high mass, undergoing in the process a certain amount of modification, and for a long time including certain parts of the old mass, especially the sung portions. The fact that the change was carried through so gradually was the result chiefly of the king's restraining influence; the conservatism of the country districts constrained him to go forward cautiously. The archbishop received a sharp rebuke in 1539 for working for new reforms before the people had been sufficiently enlightened by means of sermons. It was not the king's intention "that the Swedish mass should be forced on the people; for our salvation does not depend on this alone, that the mass is celebrated in Swedish, but it depends more upon good and Christian preachers being available in every place." But his personal dissatisfaction with the Reformers had also something to do with his slowness; and when he found in his German chancellor Norman a readier instrument, matters entered on a fresh stage.

Olaus Petri's mass came out in two fresh editions, in 1535 and 1537. In the former the principle of *lectio continua* was given up; in the latter an increased number of collects was provided, and assigned to the seasons of the liturgical year; it was also permitted that the Introit and Gradual be sung sometimes in Latin, provided that the texts be taken from the Scripture only. This can only mean that in some places the Swedish mass was becoming the chief service. At the Kyrkomöte at Uppsala in 1539 there was no thought of abolishing the Latin mass; on the other hand, at the visitation of the convent of Vadstena in 1540 the monks were ordered to use the Swedish service.

The *Articuli Ordinantiæ* of 1540 contain the first sketch of a Swedish Church Order, which is to be compared with Bugenhagen's Danish Church Order of 1539. Art. 2 treats of the daily morning and evening prayer in the churches; Art. 3 of the Litany to be chanted " by two boys " before the Sunday mass. Art. 4 contains an interesting concession; since all abuses cannot at once be removed, for the present the *Summa missa* shall continue to be celebrated daily; at the same time preachers in their instructions are to exhort the people to receive communion. But it is evident that no communions are expected at the high mass; a fact which may throw some light on the gigantic task which lay before the church, of accustoming the people to frequent communion. The *Summa missa* is, of course, the Latin mass, for as yet there was no form for high mass in Swedish. Art. 5 treats of the preparation for communion by penance, and special stress is laid on the requirement of positive knowledge of God's commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the sacraments. This is the first of a long series of Swedish canons about the safeguarding of the holy mysteries.

The liturgical year is revised in a conservative spirit (Arts. 7–12). Broadly speaking, all the Scriptural festivals are retained, including, for instance, the Purification, Annunciation, and Visitation of St. Mary, and most of the festivals of Apostles, besides certain days which were also market-days. Only Corpus Christi, the Assumption, Conception, and

Presentation of St. Mary (November 21) are condemned in so many words. But it is certain that even this limitation of the calendar was to a large extent only on paper. Art. 13 enjoins the Friday abstinence; 14, collections for the church, the poor, and the clergy on the great festivals; 15 deals with catechetical instruction, and 16 and 17 with preaching. The sermon is to be followed by an intercession for the king, the royal family, and the nobility. It is the prayer for the church which is beginning to take form, which in the modern Swedish mass corresponds closely in place and in general character with the Prayer for the Church Militant in the *Book of Common Prayer*.[1]

At the end of these articles the order of the mass itself is considered. The phrases used here are in direct conflict with the directions in Olaus Petri's mass, and only become intelligible when it is understood that it is the Latin mass that is here contemplated. Thus the first words of these directions are: " When on great festivals the priest (*sacrificans*) goes with his ministers to the altar." The Creed is to be followed by the Credo-psalm, the metrical paraphrase of the Creed in Swedish; the Preface leads up to the *Sanctus*—another difference from the Swedish rite; proper prefaces are to be used on certain days, provided they are scriptural; the Canon is not to be said, but the words of institution are to be recited in Swedish; the elevation is both retained and emphasised by the sacring-bell. It is evidently a modified Latin high mass for festal use, corresponding to that which is ordered in the contemporary Danish Church Order; and indeed the 10th article had already prescribed the use of the Latin mass on festivals. The sermon is to follow the Creed, and it is not to exceed an hour.

It is not certain whether this order ever obtained the royal assent, or was ever as a whole put into force; but in any case it is a document of great interest. No attempt is made to get rid of the Swedish mass where it had already come into use; the aim is rather to modify the Latin mass in an evangelical direction. The reason was doubtless the political necessity of advancing cautiously, and at the same time the instinctive Lutheran unwillingness to discard the solemn traditional forms of worship. Norman had imbibed the conservatism of North German Lutheranism; and if the Archbishop Laurentius Petri had also a hand in these articles, his influence must have tended in the same direction.

It is clear, therefore, that the Swedish mass was still very far from having displaced the Latin high mass as the chief service; and it is almost impossible to fix the time at which this change actually took place. There are signs of the change, as we have seen, in the edition of 1539. In the edition of 1541 the use of the Latin *Confiteor* is permitted in place of the Swedish confession; this is only intelligible at a solemn mass, when the priest alone was to communicate and it was only a pious hope that there would be other communicants. Similarly, the Latin Introit and Gradual are here permitted to be used, interchangeably with their Swedish equivalents, and use of the customary Epistles and Gospels is allowed. The sermon is now expressly mentioned as being given in the Swedish mass after the Gospel.

---

[1] See page 267 f. below.

It is therefore entirely beside the point when Quensel remarks on this last provision, that " the full Christian Sunday service was now for the first time introduced into Sweden." What had happened was simply that the Swedish mass was stepping into the place of the Latin mass. The same writer makes a similarly mistaken comment a little later on; in this edition the Swedish preface appears for the first time with musical notation, and he questions whether this was not " a reactionary step," " a sort of official endorsement of the continuance of the sung mass." On the contrary, the time had now come to give new life to the sung mass by the introduction of the vernacular in this place also.

The 1548 edition of the Swedish mass is better printed than its predecessors; specially interesting is the little woodcut at the beginning of the Preface, of a priest, in the mass vestments, before an altar on which two lights are burning, giving communion to a kneeling communicant, while others stand round. On the next page there is another of the Crucifixion, as commonly in Roman missals at the beginning of the canon. After the *Pax* there is a miniature of the Lamb and flag. In this edition the Nicene Creed is printed as well as the Apostles', and the musical notation has extended further. Finally, four new alternative post-communion collects are added—a beginning of an extension of the *de-tempore* principle at this point, which was unfortunately never carried further. In 1553 a hymnal appeared with music also for the Swedish *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Sanctus*, *Agnus*, and the *Benedicamus Domino*, in four different settings for different seasons.

The *Vadstena Articles* of 1552, for which the archbishop was in all probability chiefly responsible rather than Norman, show the change which had taken place in the ten years since the previous articles. For the first time a definite distinction is now made between "said" and "sung" mass; the former is to be wholly in Swedish, the latter partly Swedish, partly Latin; it is an exception from the common rule when "in country places the mass may be altogether sung in Swedish." Elsewhere, the Introit and *Kyrie* are probably intended to be in Latin; but "*Gloria in excelsis* is sung not otherwise than as it is printed in the mass-book," *i.e.* in Swedish; the music-book of 1553 gave the necessary settings. The Gradual might be in Swedish, but the Latin form is also permitted, and occasionally both languages might be used. The Swedish hymn has now won a definite place before the sermon. After the sermon there is to be a confession and absolution, as in the old "offene Schuld"; this is another sign that this form is intended to take the place of the Latin high mass. The Creed follows, and in towns it might be in Latin; the Preface is now definitely the Swedish, and the Latin proper prefaces are lost.

But is it expected that there will be communicants? "Since the right use of the sacrament is, that so oft as it is celebrated, some would go to communion, therefore priests are to apply themselves to exhorting the people, that so often as they celebrate the mass there should be some communicants." These words sound only too like the expression of a pious hope. The church in Sweden had the immense task, on the one hand of training people up to more frequent communion, on the other of putting an end to the formality of the Easter communion, and spreading out their communions over the year. This aim had not been attained in 1552; it has never been gained completely. It is worth noting that there was as yet no suggestion of forbidding mass to be celebrated when there were to be no communicants; this was, however, attempted ten years later.

Swedish church life at the end of Gustav Vasa's reign must have presented a singular lack of uniformity. Even the reforming party cannot have regarded the rules and formulæ as binding in every detail, and the special circumstances of a period of transition must have given an excuse for many irregularities. And while the clerical education which was necessary for the maintenance of the new standard was still lacking, the common usage must have been in many places either a profane carelessness or a stiff conservatism. A conscientious priest, at every point where the new formulæ provided no guidance, had no choice but to help himself out of the fragments of the mediæval tradition.

We have seen how the old Latin chants survived; and here the books give a minimum which was in practice exceeded. In distant country parts it is likely that the old service remained substantially unchanged.

The Swedish mass had been primarily a communion service, and the teaching of the reformers laid all the emphasis on communion. But in proportion as the new service came to take the place of the old high mass, and to be celebrated with few communicants or none at all, but with much of the ceremonial of the old rite, the dramatic side of the service, that is to say, the Memorial-aspect, came back into prominence. It is true that the leaders had difficulty in giving a theological explanation of this side of the rite, yet they did not resist the tendency. Norman was a North German Lutheran, and for Laurentius Petri the solemn forms of the traditional service had a positive value which they never had for his brother Olaus.

5. Laurentius Petri and the Church Order of 1571.

The attitude of the Archbishop in liturgical matters is clearly expressed in his *Dialogue concerning the Changes in the Mass*, which, though not printed till 1587, was written in 1542. There are four conversations in which "Simon" represents the Roman point of view, and "Petrus" that of the writer; they are largely taken up with reasons why the Latin language is not necessarily required in the church service, and discussions of the canon and of ceremonial. But these are of less interest for us than the writer's positive exposition of the meaning of the evangelical service: "For nought different is found in the Swedish mass; first, one there uses the words of consecration, the same that are written and used in the Latin mass, but for the form, wherein we agree more closely with the Evangelists than the Latin form does; before these words of consecration we have a fitting prelude or godly address to the congregation, or more rightly to make a fine thanksgiving to God for the many and great benefits that he has assured to us, and especially that he has redeemed us by the death and passion of his dear Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and given us the Sacrament for a sure pledge thereof. . . ."

The arguments of "Petrus" against the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice are of less interest to us than the concessions which he makes; these show that the idea of the

Memorial-act which we have defended in this book would have been by no means alien to Laurentius Petri's mind. He admits the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and that of self-oblation; the sacrifice of Christ is the only sacrifice for sin, but "that other sacrifice which under many names is always one, all Christian men can offer, as I said, to God's praise and glory for all the good that he hath shown them; that is, the virtues and righteous acts of Christian men, which they work in faith and in a good patience. Thus the mass can also be a sacrifice, as also the Sacrament used of old to be called the Thanksgiving or Eucharist; and I doubt not at all that the old Doctors called the mass a sacrifice for no other reason." And again: "But if you will also call the mass a sacrifice because it signifies or represents the sacrifice which Christ made upon the cross, and not as you do now appropriate the office of Christ to yourself or the priests who are said to offer it, it might well be suffered that you called it a sacrifice." Here is the Memorial-aspect; it recurs in connection with the ideas of the preceding quotation: "That the mass may be called a sacrifice for the same reason as Christian men's good deeds are so called, as you said with regard to this, that priests together with other Christians offer to God the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: this were tolerable, yea, right and Christian. One may also well say that the aforenamed Doctors call the Sacrament a sacrifice because the priest and the people set it between their sins and the wrath of God as a token of peace."

The *Dialogue* throws a useful light on the treatment of the eucharist in Laurentius Petri's great work, the *Church Order* of 1571.[1] This document, according to its author's testimony the mature fruit of thirty years' labour, gathers up in itself the positive results of the whole Swedish Reformation. By its loyalty to conservative Lutheranism in general and above all to the best traditions of the Reformation in Sweden, by its author's spirituality, tact and soundness of judgment, it stands as one of the greatest of all the existing monuments of a truly evangelical *via media*. The fact that Laurentius Petri's work shows evident signs of the influence of the German Church Orders, in particular that of Württemberg (1553), clearly establishes the essential originality of the Swedish document in matters of ritual.[2]

---

[1] Other extracts from the Church Order are available for English readers in Yelverton, *The Mass in Sweden*, pp. 58–63, and Wordsworth, pp. 232 ff.

[2] Further light has been thrown on the liturgical interests and principles of Laurentius Petri by the recent publication of his manu-

The Preface emphasises the necessity of fixed liturgical usage, and of evangelical freedom to retain ancient customs. Among the reproaches levelled at the Swedish Church from the extreme Protestant side, he mentions this: that "we with the Papists call the Lord's Supper the mass, and use therein the mass vestments, altars and frontals, gold and silver chalices and patens, consecrate and elevate the sacrament, and have other such papistical customs, with crossing and signing." This leads him to advocate deliberately the Memorial-aspect of the eucharist: "Nor have we any evil conscience for this, that we call the Lord's Supper the mass, which they hold to be great sin; for even if it were so, which yet is not fully sure, that this word (*Missa*) is Hebrew and means sacrifice[1]; so neither is it forbidden to call that Sacrament a sacrifice, as has always been done in Christendom, since that sacrifice which our High-priest Christ once made upon the cross is celebrated in the mass. So also the Scripture calls the prayers and thanksgivings, such as are used in the mass, sacrifices." It is the same point of view as in the *Dialogue*, but more clearly expressed.

The immensity of the task which the Lutheran Reformation had undertaken is well illustrated by the chapter on "The Lord's Supper, which we are wont to call the Mass"; namely, to bring back communion into the Sunday mass, and train the people to frequent and voluntary communion. But, though voluntary, it is none the less an essential part of church life; he who never goes to communion has excommunicated himself, and no formal excommunication could do more than set the seal on this. But most men are more accustomed "to hear mass, and see and adore the sacrament, than to use it rightly according to Christ's command by eating and drinking." This is the result of a lack of sense of sin. In the early church the sacrament was used daily, but when men began "to be cold-hearted and dull, so that they regarded not their sins nor this high consolation," this custom dropped out.

Mass is not to be celebrated unless there be some to communicate; the priest's own communion is not sufficient. It is regarded as the normal event that there will be a com-

---

script treatise *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (from about 1566); though this work deals primarily with the ordering of the choir-offices (mattins, evensong and compline), valuable information is also given with regard to the celebration of solemn mass.—*Sveriges första evangeliska gudstjänstordning*, edited by N. Franzén (Stockholm, 1927).

[1] The derivation of the word from the Hebrew *missāh* is here assumed, as by Luther.

munion; but the priest cannot always be disposed thereto, and rather than that the Lord's Table be arrayed and none come to receive, there shall be used instead "some godly Psalms, Preaching, and Litany, that the people may be aroused to godliness, and thereby be made better." But this is only contemplated as exceptional, and as the lesser of two evils. That non-communicants will be present throughout the service is taken for granted; but spiritual communion is not equal to sacramental communion: "it is indeed well that a man hear the Lord's words, of the founding and institution of the sacrament, but its right use does not consist in this, that he sees and gazes with his bodily eyes, but in the eating and drinking." It was indeed necessary to emphasise the primary importance of communion, but the remarkable thing is that Laurentius Petri finds real value also in the Memorial-aspect of the eucharist, as elsewhere in this Church order. It is an illuminating commentary on the slowness of the Swedish Reformation, that it was necessary even at this late date to forbid votive masses regarded as sacrifices for sin, and masses for the dead; but Laurentius Petri seems to have thought it possible that these masses might sometimes be made into communion services.

Coming now to the actual liturgical instructions, we find that the distinction between "said" and "sung" mass is now no longer made;[1] the fact that the sung mass is the rule shows that another milestone has been passed. Latin chants are, however, still permitted, as for the *Kyrie* (which may be ninefold), the Gradual on festivals, and the *Tract* during Lent, in towns where there are schools. The survival of the liturgical year is assured by the order that the collect *de tempore* or *de festo* is always to be used, and that the sermon is to be preached on the Gospel for the day. The treatise *De ecclesiasticis officiis* shows that the Latin proper prefaces could still sometimes be used—so far as they conformed to Scripture—and that in this case the *Sanctus* followed directly on the Preface, contrary to the order of the *Formula Missæ* and the Swedish mass.

In the section on church discipline, the exclusion of notorious sinners and others from communion is first dealt with. Those are to be excluded who are in such open sin as cannot be remitted otherwise than by public penance, strangers and unknown persons, children under eight or nine, the insane " so long as they are out of their wit," the excommunicate and persons of ill repute, and those who never go to church. In the ordinary way intending communicants must give their names in to the priest on the previous afternoon or on the morning itself, that he may examine them if necessary. " None shall be given the sacrament who cannot give a reason why he comes to communion, or cannot say the Lord's Prayer, Creed, Commandments, etc." ; this will normally take place at the private confession. The latter is not obligatory, but it is the evangelical form of the Roman Penance; Laurentius Petri speaks of it as the direct continuation of the ancient use. Though not limited to any fixed time, he advises that it be associated with the season before Easter.

---

[1] Yet in the liturgy of King John III (see below, p. 257 ff.) there is evidence that the mass could still sometimes be said, not sung.

At these times he recommends that the clergy should help one another, since it is often easier for a penitent to confess his sins to one who is not his own parish priest. Penances should not consist of " something to be recited, or a fast, as has been usual under the Pope " ; counsel should be given to the penitent, how he should act to overcome his own particular sins, and the priest is to consider the man's own special circumstances, " and not bind his conscience, as has been done hitherto under the Pope." The priest is to be in church if possible for half an hour before mass, " and those who hear confessions must sit in an open place in the church in all men's sight, that so they may avoid slander and suspicion." The priest is to look after his penitents' progress in Christian knowledge; but the purely didactic element is far less prominent here than in most Lutheran directories, and indeed the emphasis laid on the shepherding of souls is the most striking feature of this part of the work. One rises from a study of Laurentius Petri's rules for private penance with the impression that in neglecting to make use of them the Swedish church has lost a uniquely valuable instrument for genuine pastoral work.

Finally, it may be noted that the rules for public penance, which were indeed largely put into practice in the following hundred years, revive the disciplinary system of the early church. Those who are under public penance must " go their way as soon as the sermon is over " ; and so the ancient distinction of the Catechumens' mass and the mass of the faithful was again made actual in the church of Sweden.

6. King John III and the Liturgical Controversy.

There was no real difference of principle between Laurentius Petri's Church Order, with its effort to secure dignity and reverence in the church service, and the liturgical movement in its first phase, when it was genuinely accepted by some of the most enlightened leaders of the Swedish church. The tragedy of King John's reign was that his zeal carried him too far, and the good intentions of the liturgical movement were frustrated by the compulsory measures by which the king sought to enforce the use of the darling child of his brain, the liturgy called the *Red Book ;* by the suspicions aroused by his relations with the Roman church; but also because the splendid ideals of reunion which were in his mind were not ripe for realisation in the rough days of the Reformation. At a time when there was no adequate clerical education, and no real university in the country, and the treasures and valuables of the church had to a large extent been pillaged and wasted, his refined and intellectual piety was like an exotic plant, lacking roots in the native soil. The result was that his misguided efforts ended in the undoing of most of what he was anxious to secure.

There can be no doubt that there was still much confusion and disorder in the church. While it is true that a new generation of priests had grown up who had the principles of the Reformation in their blood, there must still have been many parish clergy who had gained their first theological impression from the mediating theology of religious humanism; in many parts of the country the people had only reluctantly accepted the new order of things, and there were clergy whose carelessness and irreverence provoked resentment and disgust. The king's efforts for reform were without doubt motived by an honest intention to act for the good of the church, and the liturgical movement was in large measure the assault of an enlightened and earnest piety upon " prophanitatis bestia "—against the very spirit which is illustrated by the abusive comments which may still be read in the margins of extant copies of the *Red Book.* At his address to the bishops at Uppsala in 1569, and at the Kyrkomöte of 1572, the king made a special complaint of the disorderly lives of the clergy. Nor must it be imagined as is so often done, that he stood alone in his desire for reform. He had a strong backing among the higher clergy, among whom were such men as Laurentius Petri Gothus and Andreas Laurentii Björnram.

The most notable document of the movement, the *Nova Ordinantia ecclesiastica* of 1575, has been consigned by posterity to an oblivion which it by no means deserved. It is a presentation of the royal *via media*, supported by careful argument and patristic quotations; and it nowhere exceeds the limits of what is permissible according to Lutheran tradition, although its spirit is very different from that of the orthodox tradition of German theology. The *ex opere operato* view of the sacraments is decisively rejected, and the principle of *extra usum nullum sacramentum* energetically maintained. The superstitious use of the sacrament is condemned in a striking passage: " When the bread over which the words of blessing have been said is put in a monstrance to be carried in procession round all the streets for a spectacle, and to be adored, as though it were itself God; or when it is carried round a conflagration, or through fields and lands, or taken by a soldier into battle to save him from being hurt by the enemy, or used at the confirming of a compact, or used for bodily healing, or for magic and superstition; or when it is offered for the living and the dead, to propitiate God and win forgiveness of sins for oneself or others, or to gain health and soundness, or good luck and success in worldly and bodily affairs; such usage is not sacramental, but an appalling misuse and idolatry, for which God will inflict hard punishment."

But the doctrine of Ubiquity as developed by Lutheran scholasticism is repudiated, and emphasis is laid on the centrality of the Incarnation, in a way that is not familiar to Lutheran ears. Herein lie our trust and consolation, " that Christ has not laid aside our human nature which once he took, nor transformed it into another nature, but in that same flesh and blood, with infinite and unspeakable honour and glory, ordains and rules all things, our almighty King and Priest to all eternity. . . . For as he has left us the pledge and assurance of the Spirit, so he has taken from us the pledge and assurance of our humanity, the pledge of the perfection which it shall at last attain. Therefore, flesh and blood, be ye of good courage, for ye have entered heaven and the Kingdom in Christ Jesus." Hence the mystery of the real presence is strongly maintained, and even locally attached to the elements, and to the moment of consecration; at the same time it is denied that the words of institution are a magic formula, the presence is declared to be spiritual, and transubstantiation is rejected. The word "pledge" is used several times, and therefore it is insisted that the words of institution are to be clearly and audibly recited.

The king's patristic studies led him to a warm sacramental piety, in comparison with which the restrained language of the older Swedish reformers sounds almost chilly. "It is a heavenly and most venerable sacrament, the Lord's most venerable Supper, a great and unsearchable mystery, the highest of all mysteries, a holy and living blessing, an awful sacrament, an awful mystery, an awful chalice, the sacrament of the communion of the body of Christ, the end of all sacraments. . . ." The benefits of communion are, first that "we are incorporated into Jesus Christ and grafted into him, that he may be in us, and we in him"; and so, "since he is lord over life and death, so I become the same also in him"—here the resurrection of the flesh is taught in a manner reminiscent of Irenæus. The third benefit of communion is the assurance of the forgiveness of sins.

His teaching about the eucharistic sacrifice is not less interesting. He combats the Romish idea of the mass as a sacrifice for sins, and maintains that according to the true and primitive doctrine the mass may be called a sacrifice first "because of the true body and blood of Christ, which are given and received in the eucharist, which were once for all a sacrifice for us, and ever retain the name which they then received"; second, because it is the pledge that the one sacrifice remains available for us; third, because it is celebrated in memory of Christ's Passion and death; and finally, there is the sacrifice of praise, "since we thank, praise, glorify, honour and call upon God in the eucharistic act, and perform our bounden duty of obedience, in remembering his Passion, death and resurrection, and proclaim them in his church; all which God of his pure grace and mercy receives as a glad and acceptable sacrifice."

Among the liturgical instructions we find special insistence that the people are all to remain till the end of mass, to share in the prayers and join in the eucharistic act, even when not communicating, "that all may unitedly thank God for all his mercies, and especially for the redemption offered to us in Christ, and pray God that he will grant to them and to all others his grace, that they may always have a will and a desire for this most comfortable food and medicine of the troubled conscience, and that he will make it to be, for those who rightly use the sacrament, for the strengthening and confirming of faith, for trust and consolation, for the forgiveness of sins, for justification and eternal salvation. This act, at which a man may delight to be present, where the Lord's Supper is administered, is for those who fear God a glorious act of confession whereby they may let it be seen what they hold about the Lord's Supper, and so set to others a Christian example, and a sign that they show to this sacrament fitting honour and reverence, and that it is for their own good, when they celebrate it in a right godly spirit. So also churches have not been built only in order that men may there hear sermons, but also that each and every Christian who goes thither may together with others pray to God for all needs." This view of the Memorial-act is not inconsistent with Lutheran tradition, but it is more clearly expressed here than in most of the other documents of the Reformation period.

The Red Book, *Liturgia Svecanæ Ecclesiæ catholicæ et orthodoxæ conformis*,[1] appeared in 1576. It has been the subject probably of more controversy than any other document of the Swedish church; it has been condemned less for its own sake than as the symbol of a much misunderstood ecclesiastical programme. The hate and the abuse which were hurled at it in the heat of the conflict were indeed not deserved; but there is certainly a tendency for modern judgments in some quarters to go to the opposite extreme.[2] It was the liturgy which was the main cause of the failure of the reform movement, whose chief monument is the *Nova ordinantia*. Patient work on the lines of the latter document, building on the liturgical tradition already in existence, might have achieved much. As it was, John III's conviction of the superlative excellence of his liturgy tempted him into a reckless attempt to hurry the slow processes of natural growth.

The Preface contains an apology for the extent to which the book deals with outward ceremonies, on the ground that the inward must always express itself through the outward.[3]

---

[1] Printed in full, with translation, in Yelverton, *The Mass in Sweden*, pp. 75 ff.

[2] Such as Yelverton: "So there passed on to the bookshelf a liturgical masterpiece, whose beauty would henceforth be lost to all but a few antiquarians treading the byways of liturgiology."—p. 74.

[3] "Nam cuius hominis externa membra nullam pietatem ostendunt, anne huius cordi veram inesse pietatem recte dixeris? Ex abundantia cordis profecto os loquitur, oculi torquentur, manus pedesque gestiunt. Magna siquidem pars pietatis in ceremoniis sita est. Cum Deo non solum corde, sed manibus ac pedibus sit serviendum."

The rite itself is preceded by devotional instructions for the priest's private preparation, which have unfortunately not been reproduced in any form in later editions of the Swedish Prayer Book, and prayers to be said by him while vesting. The visual and dramatic side of the rite is emphasised by the copious rubrical directions. It begins with the priest's preparation at the altar, closely modelled on the Latin form; the congregation meanwhile have nothing to do but look on. It was indeed no novelty that the use of the Swedish general confession was left optional, and that the Latin introits and graduals or tracts were permitted; but there was real novelty in the re-introduction of the Offertory, with the bringing of the elements to the altar, and the *Lavabo*. This is followed by a prayer for the church, partly modelled on the *Te igitur* of the missal, and passing on to a sort of Epiclesis. Then comes the Preface, for which eight proper forms are provided, besides two forms of the *prefatio communis;* but, as in previous Swedish liturgies, the Preface leads up to the words of institution. It is really surprising that a rite which could in other ways deal so radically with Lutheran tradition did not succeed in restoring the *Sanctus* to its right place.

But without doubt the most daring feature of the liturgy is the canon which follows the *Sanctus*. It is based on the latter part of the Roman canon, beginning with the *Unde et memores*, but ingeniously revised, and occasionally using the language of the Greek liturgies—a rare feature in the liturgical work of the sixteenth century. Thus the first sentence of the Anamnesis, "Memores igitur et nos, Domine, salutaris huius mandati," is taken from the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, and the rest of this prayer, though closely corresponding to the Latin *Unde et memores*, is so rewritten as to express admirably the idea of the act of memorial, in which the church appeals to the sacrifice of the cross: "The same thy Son, the same sacrifice, who is a pure, holy, and undefiled sacrifice set forth for our atonement, our shield, defence, and covering against thy wrath, against the terror of sins and of death, we take and receive with faith, and with our humble prayers we offer before thy glorious majesty." These words were particularly offensive to the opponents of the liturgy; yet similar thoughts had been expressed, as we have seen, by Laurentius Petri. Other parts of the canon are of great beauty. But it was disastrous, under the circumstances, that it corresponded so plainly with the Roman form; for wherever possible the opening words of each section of the Latin canon had been reproduced. And the pity of it all was that there was now no reason why the king and his collaborators should not have gone back to pre-Roman tradition, and created an evangelical liturgy out of primitive materials. This weakness for the Roman form, as though it were the only conceivable model, is one of the fundamental defects of the liturgy; the other is its uncritical acceptance of Lutheran tradition in the placing of the *Sanctus*.

On the canon follows the Lord's Prayer, with the ancient introduction, and a modified *embolismus ;* then the *Pax*, the exhortation (optional), and a version of two of the prayers which precede the priest's communion in the missal, then the *Agnus Dei*, and the communion; here, as in other Swedish rites, the priest's communion follows that of the people. The five alternative post-communions, the *Benedicamus Domino*, and the blessing correspond to the rite of 1557.

The decision of the Uppsala-möte of 1593 finally sealed the fate of this liturgy. Yet it stands to the credit of the assembly that it refused to be driven by the reaction against the liturgical movement into an extreme Puritanism. It was content to require " a Christian freedom " in the maintenance and the use of " our old printed mass-book and the Church Order sanctioned in '72." It was surprisingly moderate in its regulation of various details which had been matters of controversy, such as the surplice, the bishop's cope, ministers at mass, the sacring-bell at the elevation, the *Lavabo ;* according to one account there was an unanimous decision to give up all these, but when Duke Charles pressed for the abolition of a great deal more, such as altar-lights, vestments, and the sign of the cross, the assembly refused to be hurried. In regard to the use of the lights at the Gospel and the sacring-bell, it was ordered that the people should be advised of the impending disuse of these things, till such time as they could be abolished without offence; and the elevation itself was treated as a matter in itself innocent, but spoilt by misuse. In 1595 the definite resolution was taken to abolish the elevation, though not without some grumbling from the conservative side.

The ceremonies in question were traditional usages, of which it would be truer to say that they had survived till this time than that they had been revived by the liturgical movement, though it had certainly laid special emphasis upon them; and when we take into account the pressure exerted by Duke Charles in a Protestant direction, we cannot fail to recognise a definite unwillingness on the part of the assembly to lose traditional customs. In cases where some usage had led to abuses, they were prepared to concede that if the instructions of the bishops and clergy were not sufficient to stop the evil, the usage itself should be allowed to drop. This is an indication of the liking which the popular mind still retained for the old ceremonies; and the unwillingness of the concession is evidence of a regard for the dramatic side of the service as a whole, of which the Uppsala fathers themselves were no better able than other Lutheran theologians to give a theoretical justification.

Another reason is to be found in the danger which threatened from the opposite direction to that of the liturgical movement. We cannot here discuss Duke Charles' religious views; but it is evident that the proposed liturgy for which he was responsible definitely bore the stamp of the Reformed tradition, particularly in the form in which it appeared in 1600. The revised edition of 1602 [1] was an almost unique compromise between Lutheran and Reformed usage.

The form thus proposed for adoption retained a large part of the *Missa catechumenorum*, including *Kyrie* and *Gloria*, which had been absent in the earlier version. Then followed the salutation, a fixed collect, which is almost a general confession, followed by an absolution; then an invitation to communion, Olaus Petri's general confession, and a long didactic exhortation; then the account of the institution from 1 Cor. xi, after the Reformed model, read as a lesson. There was no Gospel; the liturgical year was wholly given up. Then came the Preface and the rest, on the lines of the traditional Swedish mass.

7. The Swedish Rite from 1614 to the Present Day.

With the Prayer Book of 1614 we reach the conclusion of the liturgical development of the Swedish Reformation. The rejection of the liturgical movement on the one side, and Charles IX's Calvinism on the other, made loyalty to the old traditions of the Swedish Reformation the guiding principle.

The Swedish mass was now altogether a sung mass, and the alternative use of Latin chants had completely disappeared in favour of Swedish hymns. The definite rule that the full service was not to be held when there were no communicants is a sign that the liturgy of "Table Prayers" was now about to begin its slow advance, which was to make it at last a regular alternative to the complete eucharist. The penitential note, typical of Lutheranism, is very fully expressed in the confession and absolution at the beginning of the service, and the additional confession and absolution (which, however, was optional) in the prayers after the sermon; besides the confession and absolution, which is taken for granted as the normal preparation of the communicants. However, both the penitential acts in the service itself came to be regularly used (although the absolution was dropped in the prayers after the sermon), and were made binding in 1811; this powerfully accentuated the penitential character which still clings to the Swedish service. Olaus Petri's two prefaces were retained; for all hope of a recovery of proper prefaces had been taken away by the awful example of the Red Book. The exhortation before communion received an addition emphasising both the real presence and the danger of unworthy reception.

---

[1] Printed in full in *The Mass in Sweden*, pp. 127 ff. Yelverton's judgment of it as " a glaring example of liturgical impropriety " seems certainly to be an exaggeration.

Thus the promise of the sixteenth century remained in large measure unrealised, thanks chiefly to the misguided zeal of the liturgical movement; and the rite of 1614 shows very little real advance on the first Swedish mass of Olaus Petri. At the same time, the fact that the type thus formed had survived through strife and controversy gave it an inner vitality such as no other Lutheran liturgy possessed. The idea of the eucharist, as seen in this rite and in seventeenth-century Sweden in general, is perhaps the most characteristically Lutheran of all Lutheran types, both in its strength and in its weakness. The tenacity which held on to ancient church usage in such matters as the retention of the mass vestments kept firm hold in practice on the visual and dramatic side of the service, of which theology had no explanation to give; and loyalty to the Swedish Reformation became a safeguard against further liturgical impoverishment. It is therefore a fact of real importance that the original model of the Swedish rite had been the *Formula Missæ*, not the *Deutsche Messe*.

In Sweden as in Germany the slow decline of the eighteenth century, in all that concerned the church's worship, was followed by the beginnings of a recovery in the nineteenth. But in Sweden the forms of the liturgy showed an incomparably greater vitality; and thus the modern movement towards liturgical renovation has the advantage of starting from a practically unbroken tradition.

The lowest point of decline was reached in the Prayer Book of 1811. One of the two lections was cut out, the Gospel, as it was read from the pulpit as the regular text of the sermon; and the Apostles' Creed altogether displaced the Nicene. Of the Preface only the introductory responses survived, in a mutilated form; "God lift up our hearts" took the place of the *Habemus ad Dominum.* The *Sanctus* remained after the words of institution, but the zeal of the "Enlightenment" for purity of language insisted on removing the *Hosanna*, rich in associations with the Jewish origins of the eucharist, and with the thoughts of the Advent season, and putting in its place the banal substitute "Give salvation from on high." Similarly, "Lord Sabaoth" had to be abolished as an intolerable Hebraism. The liturgical year had already in 1772 been cut down by the excision of the Festivals of Apostles. Finally, the liturgy of Table Prayers was more definitely accepted as a regular and normal alternative to the full eucharist. It is true, however, that the Book of 1811 did little more than legalise the practice which had in large measure already become general.

The reaction against this latitudinarian Prayer Book, which had begun with the evangelical movement of the "New Readers" (*nyläsarna*) in Norrland, found a liturgical expression in the work of the high-church school of Lund, which, under the leadership of E. G. Bring, followed in the steps of the German movement headed by Kliefoth and Löhe. In their proposals of 1854 some of the damage done in 1811 was repaired; but little more was done than to restore the liturgical Gospel. The revision of 1894 followed the same lines: the communion exhortation of Olaus Petri was now at last abolished, and the Preface was restored and revised, so that the longer of the two alternatives now in use allows in some measure the note of Paschal triumph to ring out, though the other is wholly dominated by penitential gloom. Permission was now given for the priest to give to each railful of communicants a Scripture text before they return to their places; a usage which may indeed allow the subjective ideas of the celebrant to intrude in an unpleasant way upon the high objectivity of the rite, but which at least gives further emphasis to the beautiful Swedish custom, that all remain kneeling at the altar-rails till the whole railful has received; a custom which unites in a happy way the positive value of kneeling communion with that of the Reformed usage of sitting at the table. The prayer for the church after the sermon was now transferred from the pulpit to the altar; this change was doubtless prompted by a right liturgical instinct, but it has the less happy effect of rounding off the liturgy of Table Prayers, and giving it the appearance of forming by itself a complete whole.

The present service[1] bears clear witness to the continuity of Swedish liturgical tradition, and also, perhaps, to its sterility. The parallel between the sixteenth-century rites and that of to-day is in all essentials surprisingly close. It witnesses to an obstinate determination not to lose hold of what had once been gained, and at the same time to a dreadful incapacity to learn anything new. The early Lutheran services were, in spite of all their merits, scarcely masterpieces of liturgical form; the religious experience which underlay them, and the knowledge of history available at the time, were both narrowly limited. The fact that the Swedish service follows the richer of the two Lutheran types was more the result of an accident of history than of any deep insight into the essential character of the eucharist. This tradition came to be treated as sacrosanct less on the ground of its real merits than because it stood as a symbol of the rejection of the liturgical movement. The fact that in later times it has been a sort of palladium of the evangelical faith has indeed saved the Swedish liturgy from destructive revision, but has hardly assisted its healthy development.

But the most important liturgical change which has happened since the Reformation has yet to be mentioned. An Act of January 29, 1861, ordered "that if in any church, on particular occasions and with a view to particular circumstances, it should appear to be necessary that the Communion should be administered at some other time than in connection with the chief Sunday service, the Pastor may agree thereto with the parishioners."

Those who were responsible for this enactment can hardly have foreseen the full significance of the permission that was being given, and the lengths to which it would be carried. From the liturgical point of view it signified a breach with the tradition of Christian worship that had lasted at least from Justin Martyr's day. The country districts have indeed been little affected, and there the eucharist is still normally celebrated at the chief service, though as a rule far from frequently. But very many town churches, especially in the capital, have regarded themselves as justified by this Act, which evidently had only exceptional circumstances in view, in making a common practice of celebrating the eucharist apart from the chief service; as a rule in the evening, occasionally in the morning. In this case the whole of the *Missa catechumenorum* is omitted, and the Public Confession (*Skriftermål*) is immediately followed by the *Sursum corda.* Such a practice has doubtless certain practical advantages, but it is directly opposed to the genuine Lutheran tradition, being an imitation of the German practice, which is the result of Reformed influence; and in Sweden it has contributed very largely to rob the sacrament of its central place in the church's worship.

---

[1] See the Additional Note at the end of this section.

Finally, it is necessary to glance at the system of church discipline and the relation of communion to citizenship. Here the Lutheran churches were faced with a problem which was, in fact, insoluble; on the one hand, with the help of the law to raise up safeguards against unworthy reception of the sacrament, and on the other to make every citizen of good standing a regular communicant The legislation of the seventeenth century shows the record of the persistent attempts to attain this end, and combine evangelical freedom with the rigorism of law.

The Church Order of Laurentius Petri refused to make Penance (*i.e.* private confession) obligatory; but later ordinances tended more and more in this direction, while at the same time the didactic side became more and more prominent, at the expense of the pastoral side. Archbishop Andreas Laurentii Björnram, before the end of the sixteenth century, had to forbid the bad custom of priests filling the sacristy with people and giving them all a little sermon, and then pronouncing absolution. But we hear again and again of people coming in crowds to the priest and receiving absolution *en masse;* and in 1686 the attempt to resist this practice was given up. Private confession was now the exception; and the final result is seen in the Prayer Book of 1811, in which the address is the chief concern, and the absolution only secondary, and given in a conditional form. Yet till 1916 attendance at the Public Confession was obligatory for all communicants; and it must still always be held before every celebration. This practice is, however, the subject of some debate at the present time.

The problem of the relation of communion and citizenship is well summed up in two paragraphs of the church law. The first insists on the duty of the clergy to teach their people the meaning of communion, that " their heart may be awakened, worthily to prepare themselves, often, at least three or four times each year, to take and receive the holy sacrament for the strengthening of faith, and for their souls' eternal salvation; concerning which preparation, and in what it consists, the congregation shall be often and carefully instructed." The following paragraph contained till 1863 the following fateful words: "Whosoever shall recusantly abstain for more than a year and a day from the Lord's Table shall be regarded and addressed as a non-Christian, against whom proceedings may be taken after the manner which has been defined concerning public penance and ban." Thus to receive communion was a condition of membership of the church, which at that time was identical with full citizenship of the state. In the series of disciplinary regulations, culminating with the greater excommunication, the ecclesiastical and the political sides were interwoven to an extent which threatened to make the church into a branch of the police, and proportionately obscured the sacred character of her rites.

Public penance was abolished in 1855; exclusion from communion as a result of certain crimes remained till 1918. As we have mentioned, the second paragraph of the church law was only repealed in 1863; its long survival is a sign of the obstinate persistence of the old state-church constitution. The breakdown of this system of church discipline enforced by law leaves the church face to face with the problem of safeguarding the sacrament on other lines, and of envisaging anew the relation between church and state. But the fact that the act of communion no longer involves political consequences can only be regarded as pure gain from the evangelical point of view.

Additional Note: The Modern Swedish Liturgy.

The Swedish service is available in English in two books by the Rev. E. E. Yelverton; *The Mass in Sweden* (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1919), which contains the mediæval rite, Olaus Petri's mass, extracts from Laurentius Petri's Church Order, John III's mass, Charles IX's mass, and the modern rite, with an English translation; and a smaller book, *The Swedish Rite* (S.P.C.K., 1921), which is a translation of the official Prayer Book, *Handbok för svenska kyrkan*, containing the services, but not collects, epistles and gospels, nor psalms.

The following translation of the Swedish service is taken (by permission) from the latter work, with a few corrections.

1. PUBLIC CONFESSION (SKRIFTERMÅL).

This must be held before every celebration of the eucharist. It consists of—

A hymn.
An address from the altar.
A general confession ("I, poor sinful man . . ." *see below*).
Absolution, as follows:

If this your confession of sin is sincere, and therefore you with a penitent heart desire forgiveness of your sins for Jesus Christ's sake, then it is sure and certain, in the power of God's word and promise, that God in his mercy forgiveth you all your sins: and I pronounce unto you this forgiveness of your sins by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

A prayer for a worthy communion.
Reading of a hymn-verse or short Bible Text.
The Grace.

2. THE PUBLIC SERVICE (HÖGMÄSSA).

The service begins with a hymn, during which the priest goes to the altar; but on solemn occasions two priests often officiate together.

(*On certain festivals, ten altogether, an Introit may be sung, such as the following for Christmas Day:*

Priest: Behold, I bring you tidings of great joy. Halleluja!
People: Which shall be to all people. Halleluja!
Priest: For unto you is born a Saviour. Halleluja!
People: He is Christ the Lord. Halleluja!
Priest: Glory be to the Father, etc.
People: As it was in the beginning, etc.)

On all other days the priest begins:

Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Sabaoth! the whole earth is full of his glory.

The Lord is in his holy temple, his throne is in heaven; yet he is near to them that are of an humble and contrite spirit. He heareth the sighing of the penitent and hearkeneth unto their prayer. Let us therefore draw near trustfully to his throne of grace, and confess our sin and debt:

I, poor sinful man, who was born in sin and ever afterwards have offended against thee in manifold ways all the days of my life, heartily confess before thee, O holy and righteous God, Father of Love, that I have not loved thee above all else, nor my neighbour as myself. Against thee and thy holy commandments I have sinned in thoughts, words, and deeds, and know that I am worthy to be cast away from thy face, if thou shouldst judge me, as my sins have deserved. But now thou hast promised, dear heavenly Father, to embrace with gentleness and mercy all penitent sinners, who turn to thee and with a lively faith seek refuge in thy fatherly kindness and the merits of their Saviour, Jesus Christ. For unto such thou wilt grant remission of all their sins against thee, and thou wilt never more impute unto them their transgressions. In this, I, miserable sinner, put my faith, and pray thee trustfully that thou wilt after thy promise vouchsafe to be merciful and gracious to me, and forgive me all my sins, to the praise and honour of thy holy name.

May the almighty merciful God after his great and unfathomable mercy forgive us all our sins for Jesus Christ our Saviour's sake, and give us grace to amend our ways, and with him attain everlasting life. Amen.

But when this form of confession has been used at the Public Confession, another form is here substituted; on certain days an adaptation of Ps. 51 may be used.

Then is sung :

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.

The priest sings :

Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good will towards men.

On greater days, the people continue :

We praise thee; we worship thee; we give thanks to thee for thy great wonders, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father almighty: O Lord, the only begotten Son of the all highest, Jesus Christ: O Holy Spirit, Spirit of grace, truth, and peace. Amen. Amen. Amen.

On ordinary days, the people sing the first verse of Hymn 24, Allena Gud i himmelrik.

—The Lord be with you.
—The Lord be with thee also.
—Let us pray.

The Collect for the day.
The Epistle.
The Gradual hymn. (Gradualpsalmen.)
The Gospel.

Then follows the Apostles' Creed ; but on festivals the Nicene Creed may be used.

Then follows a hymn, during which the priest leaves the altar and goes to the pulpit.

He first reads the appointed text, on which the sermon must be preached ; i.e. *either the Gospel for the day over again, or one of two other Gospel passages, in a three-yearly sequence.*

The Sermon.
A prayer, as printed in the Handbok.
The notices.
A text (välönskan).
Then a hymn is sung, during which he goes to the altar.

A. WHEN THE LORD'S SUPPER IS CELEBRATED.

The priest proceeds :

—The Lord be with you.
—The Lord be with thee also.
—Let us pray.

(*On great festivals, a prayer appointed for the day is to be used here. Then follows, on all days, the Prayer for the Church, except that in Lent and on the first Rogation Day the Litany is used.*)

Almighty, eternal God, Maker and Sustainer of all things, to thee we call. Be gracious to us for Jesus Christ's sake, and remember not our sins. Sanctify and govern us with thy Holy Spirit, and give us grace to walk according to thy word in holiness of life. Unite, strengthen and preserve thy Christendom through the word and the holy sacraments. Have pity, Lord, upon all peoples, who are yet bound in the night of blindness and death, and may thy saving grace arise upon them through the Gospel with light and life.

(Bless them who are now assembled together to confer on the affairs of thy church, that their consultations may promote thy honour and the edifying of thy kingdom in our midst.)

Be the guard and shield of our fatherland, and give it grace and honour. Bless and preserve our beloved king, and all his house, and their kinsfolk. Grant thy help to the government and defence of the kingdom.

(Bless the parliament now assembled together, that they may debate and settle all things in the fear of God and in the bond of unity.)

Give peace and prosperity to our common life, righteous and Christian counsel in all that we undertake. Promote every good work and turn away from us all evil and harm. May thy blessing rest upon the crops of the earth, and likewise upon all lawful callings and estates.

Bless our homes and give grace for the upbringing and growth of the young in thy truth and fear.

(Look with thy special grace upon those children who are being prepared for their first communion. Grant unto them Christian insight and unfeigned faith, that they may ever walk as thy true disciples in the way of thy truth.)

Bless also the guests at thy holy table, that they may be strengthened there in faith and love and the hope of everlasting life.

Help and comfort all sick and poor, the desolate and the oppressed, those who are afflicted and dying. Give thy gracious protection to all widows and all that are defenceless. Help us finally in our last hour, and grant us after this transitory life eternal salvation; through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord. Amen.

(*Two alternatives to this prayer have recently been permitted.*)

Then follows a short hymn, during which the elements are prepared. Then the priest sings:

—Lift up your hearts to God.
—God lift up our hearts.
—Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.
—Worthy is he alone of thanks and praise.

—Yea, verily it is meet, right and blessed, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks and praise to thee, almighty Father, holy God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. He is our Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, the pure Lamb of God, who bore the sin of the world even unto death. Like as he hath vanquished death and risen again and lives for ever, even so shall all who put their trust in him vanquish sin and death through him, and inherit life everlasting. And that we may not forget this his inestimable benefit, he hath instituted his holy supper.

(*For the alternative preface see below.*)

In the night when the Lord Jesus was betrayed he took bread, gave thanks to God, brake it and gave to the disciples and said: Take ye and eat. This is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.

Likewise also he took the cup, gave thanks to God and gave to the disciples and said: Drink ye all of this. This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

Let us all pray now as the Lord Jesus Christ himself hath taught us; Our Father, which art in heaven, etc.

Then is sung :

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Grant salvation from on high. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Grant salvation from on high.

The priest then says or sings :

The peace of the Lord be with you.

Then the communicants come forward, while the people sing :

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, save us, merciful Lord God.
O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, hear us, merciful Lord God.
O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant us thy peace and blessing.

The words of administration are :

—The body of Christ, given for thee.
—The blood of Christ, shed for thee.

And before each row of communicants leaves the holy table :

The Lord Jesus Christ, whose body and blood ye have received, preserve you unto everlasting life. Amen.
Go in the peace of the Lord.

Then the priest says :

Let us pray.

We thank thee, almighty Father, who, through thy Son, Jesus Christ, hast instituted this holy communion to our comfort and salvation; and we pray thee, grant us grace so to celebrate the remembrance of Jesus on earth, that we may also be partakers of the great communion in heaven. Amen.

Or one of two alternative collects.

Priest : Let us thank and praise the Lord.
People : To the Lord be thanks and praise. Halleluja. Halleluja. Halleluja.
Priest : Bow your hearts to God and receive the blessing.
The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make his countenance to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord turn his countenance toward you and give you peace.
In the Name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

People : Amen. Amen. Amen.

The service ends with a short hymn.

The alternative preface is as follows :

Yea, verily it is meet, right, and blessed that we should at all times and in all places give thanks and praise to thee, almighty Father, holy God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, whom thou for our sins hast given and suffered to die for us, who were worthy of death, that we may live through him. And that we may not forget this his inestimable benefit, he hath instituted this holy supper.

The alternative form of administration is as follows :

—Jesus Christ, whose body thou receivest, preserve thee unto everlasting life.
—Jesus Christ, whose blood thou receivest, preserve thee unto everlasting life.
A text from Scripture, such as The grace and peace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. *And then* Go in the peace of the Lord.

B. WHEN THE LORD'S SUPPER IS NOT CELEBRATED:

The Salutation, and the Prayer for the Church, as above, or, during Lent, the Litany.
Our Father . . .
Let us thank and praise . . . *as above.*
Bow your hearts . . .
The Blessing.

8. The Decline of Communion, and the Present Problem.

We have no right to draw an idealistic picture of the days when practically every citizen was a regular communicant. To a large extent it was law and custom rather than spiritual hunger and thirst that brought those multitudes to the altar; and there must have been many whose lives made their communions sacrilegious. There is the story of the soldier finding a substitute to fill his place at his regimental communion. Assuredly there was full justification for the warnings of the peril of unworthy communion which became the constant theme of sermons, from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards.

But to-day we are more in danger of under-estimating the positive value of the religion of those days. We possess a sketch of the Swedish service drawn as seen by a German visitor, von Schubert, in the early nineteenth century. He notes the solemn entry of the officiating priest, with chalice and paten, followed by the clerk or churchwarden with wafer-box and flagon of wine, and the threefold bow of the communicants, " which the priest does not acknowledge, because he knows that it is given not to him, but to the Holy One." " Everywhere the sacrament is received with great devotion; the spectator cannot refrain his eyes from tears of joyful emotion, when he sees the heavenly light on the faces, filled with inwardness and spirituality; and arising out of this, the devout part which those who do not communicate take in the holy rite. The outward ceremonial is very solemn, almost wholly such as it was ordered by the Reformers." Often, where there is a church room near to the church, the communicants assemble there after the service, and read their psalm-books or other devotional books.

The meaning of communion to the individual soul is a matter withdrawn from human judgment. But it may surely be said that even Lutheran individualism could not prevent the general communion of those days from being a mighty witness to Christian fellowship; and the holy rite was celebrated with seriousness and solemnity, if there was little of eucharistic gladness. Further, the self-examination and penitence must have been factors of great importance in moulding the life of the people; and many a country congregation stood on a moral level which can only arouse our wondering reverence. And we may well ask what penitence and communion must have meant in the early days of the religious revival in the last century.

We gather from von Schubert that in his day the eucharist was celebrated every Sunday in some few town churches and large churches in the country; elsewhere the frequency varied between every other Sunday and once in six weeks, besides the great festivals. Very rarely there were only three celebrations a year. As a rule there were fewer celebrations during the cold weather and at specially busy times; at other seasons there might be communion on several Sundays in succession, but this usage was not approved by the Chapters. It was usual for people to come to communion at more or less regular times, usually twice to four times a year, but in some cases eight times. In a large country church there might be 500 communicants at one service. This information dates, as we have said, from the early nineteenth century.

But the modern history of the eucharist in Sweden is the history of its decline. The stages can be traced in the episcopal reports at Diocesan Synods (*prästmöten*). Thus in Uppsala diocese there was in 1859 nothing abnormal to report; in 1865 Archbishop Reuterdahl notes that "recent legislation has made absence from the Sacraments possible without providing any other external means of counteracting this possibility. Consequently there are now a number who are not baptised, and still more who do not receive communion. While such negligence is to be deplored, it is admittedly preferable to compulsory baptism and communion." Archbishop Sundberg in 1873 says that there are no complaints of a diminution of communicants, but that a few separatist groups are holding aloof from the church's altar. But in 1891 it is evident that the old custom is fast breaking up; "from nearly all parts of the diocese there are laments over the continuous decline of communions," sometimes to one-half of the former number, sometimes to one-tenth. But the rise of the nonconformist sects is not the only reason; there is a new sensitiveness of conscience, so that "people generally will not now receive communion simply in order to observe an old custom, but only after earnest self-examination to seek satisfaction for a spiritual need." The archbishop warns his clergy that this sensitiveness is often over-scrupulous and that a too great severity may frighten away from the sacrament many who might find there greater blessing than ever they had dreamed.

At Archbishop Ekman's first Synod in 1901 the process is complete. Now it is only in rare cases that the proportion of communions to total population rises above 50 per cent., and over 100 have 10 per cent. or less. Similarly, in 1915 it is reported that in a number of places communion is falling into disuse, or becoming, like baptism, a sacrament received only once in a lifetime. In 1921 there was little essential change, but it was reported in a number of places that the tide seemed to have turned, and that the number of communicants was beginning to increase.

Reports from most of the other dioceses would show a similar process at work. In the most recent reports there is improvement to be noted in the church attendance generally; but when the churches begin to fill up again, the people do not immediately find their way back to the altar. Even in the diocese (Strängnäs) where the decline has been most serious, and communion had come to a very large extent to be limited to first communion, the impression given by the latest report is that the worst point has been passed, and that pastoral oversight of the newly-confirmed is producing its results. In Härnösand diocese there are some remarkable reports of a really encouraging increase.

But the decline of communion has not been universal; certain parts of Western Sweden, notably on the west coast, have remained strongholds of old-fashioned Lutheranism. Thus some parishes in Skara diocese have percentages exceeding 100. Some years ago much higher figures could still be reported. In the diocese of Gothenburg, regular, but not very frequent communion, preceded by careful preparation, is the rule to a very large extent in many places.

While it is true that no part of the church can be healthy so long as it lives on its past, it would seem that these districts of Western Sweden may be compared to hibernating-places, in which some of the most valuable parts of our church inheritance may be preserved through the winter. But elsewhere, already in not a few places where all seemed to be dead, the green blades of spring are appearing above the ground.

We cannot here attempt any detailed analysis of the causes of the present crisis. Two points may, however, be noted: first, that the change in the old church law coincided in time with the rise of the evangelical movement, and that one result of this movement was the quickening of conscience, that reacted with abhorrence against the old profanation of communion, and set up fresh ideals of worthy preparation. Thus the preaching of the clergy about the necessity of repentance and the peril of unworthy communion met with an unexpected response; and it is certain that many have been kept away from the altar for very dread, and then also by the natural timidity of the mind in presence of that which it does not understand, all the more when it becomes unfamiliar. Nor did the clergy know when it was time to exchange warning tones for those of invitation and encouragement. A second factor arising out of the evangelical movement has been the development of that movement into "free churches" with communion services of their own. It was the free-church communion service at Uppsala Missionshus in 1876 that marked the beginning of the chief of the schisms which have divided Swedish Christianity. There the aspect of fellowship, which the church has neglected, has been chiefly prominent; the Reformed type of eucharist has been the model, and the deeper elements of the church sacrament, above all the element of mystery, have been mainly absent.

Thus at the time when the old legal sanctions were abolished, the Swedish church failed to give the positive religious message that might have provided for the eucharist a surer claim to the central place in the church's worship. The contrast between Sweden and England in the nineteenth century is highly instructive. The abolition of legal compulsion coincided in the former case with the beginning both of the decline of communion and of the failure of the eucharist to retain its place as the chief Sunday service; in the latter, with an amazing revival of sacramental life. The old high-church school of Lund rediscovered the beauty of the institutional church, of ecclesiastical office and authority, but they did not find their way to the spring of life within.

Swedish churchmen have been exceedingly slow to realise the significance of the decline of communion,[1] and to perceive how serious has been the loss to the religion of the people in the disappearance of the regular communion which was once a normal fact in their spiritual life, at once searching, inspiring, and life-giving in its rhythmical recurrence. On the liturgical side it has meant the loss of the classical form of the Christian service; common prayer loses its natural focus, Christian worship misses the central expression of the beauty of holiness. The tyranny of the pulpit, only in part mitigated by the liturgical service which remains, ousts from the central place the sacred drama of the eucharist; and the exposition of the word by the preacher, too often the exposition of his subjective opinions, takes the place of the objective word of the sacrament. The result is seen in the listless passivity which now comes to be the normal attitude of the churchgoer.

And further, the disuse of the sacrament means that theological thought loses an indispensable stimulus to the ever-renewed sounding of spiritual depths which cannot indeed be fathomed by human thought, but which can never be neglected if theology is to remain Christian. For the central secret of genuinely Christian theology is the holding in combination of the two contrasted opposites of God's Transcendence and Immanence; and precisely at this point the eucharist is the surest safeguard of a sound theology.

But nothing could be more fantastic than to interpret the decline as the symptom of a movement of the age, a mighty drift against whose irresistible advance it were vain to struggle. On the contrary, the recent and especially the contemporary history of Christendom shows that sacramental religion is an indispensable element in the Christian inheritance. We have only to look around us, to England, Denmark, French Calvinism, even Germany itself; everywhere the ground is being prepared for a revival of sacramental religion.

It is for Swedish churchmen not merely to hold on to the relics of an earlier age which have not yet been submerged by the flood, but rather to assume the offensive, and confidently claim for the sacrament the central place in Christian worship which belongs to it by right, and its supreme importance as the indispensable spring of life to the individual soul. It is not for us merely to go back to the catch-words and the forms of the Reformation period; for while, as we have seen, the revival of Christian life at the Reformation was also a revival of sacramental life, that period was characterised by a grievous undervaluing of the Memorial-aspect which had been exaggerated and distorted in the Roman mass; and the various evangelical churches soon settled down to cultivate each its own particular aspect of the holy rite.

---

[1] Similarly in Wordsworth's *National Church of Sweden* the decline of communion is not even noticed.

No church has any right to give up what her own history has taught her. There is a variety of aspects of the eucharist, and a variety of eucharistic types; among these stands Lutheranism, with its depth of piety, and its peculiar development of what we have called the Synoptic mystery-type. The essential quality of the sacramental renaissance which is now on its way, is that the various types are not only to learn from one another, but also to help one another to deepen their hold on the historic tradition of Christendom. And this seems to be the way in which the Sacrament of the Eucharist shall even in the Church of Sweden recover the place which for the time being it has lost, and rise again perhaps with greater glory than before. For it is only when the rich manifoldness of the simple eucharistic act is duly recognised that it can take its place as the natural centre of Christian worship and of the devotional life, and nourish and satisfy all varieties of temperament.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

THE study of the eucharist can be approached from a variety of directions. The student of Comparative Religion seeks to interpret the central act of Christian worship by its likeness or unlikeness to the rituals which have engaged his attention in other religions. The theologian tends to define its meaning in accordance with some dominant idea of his system, or else, following the traditional lines of dogmatic theology, he discusses the relation of the *signum* and the *res*. Both methods run the risk of doing violence to the subject through imposing on it an alien point of view.

The primary aim of the investigation which we have undertaken here has been to do justice to the manifold richness of the idea of the eucharist, which emerges from the study of it as a historical reality. We have surveyed various forms which it has taken in various churches of Christendom, not with the object of finding the points at which tradition has declined from some normative type, but, on the contrary, looking for the expressions in history of various sides of the sacred rite, whose very differences bring out its different aspects with greater richness. We have been, as it were, contemplating a polished jewel, each of whose facets shows some different and beautiful refraction of one and the same light. It follows that it is only for the purposes of theoretical analysis that the various aspects of the eucharist can be treated as separate. In the life of religion, and in the actual reality of worship, they are always found blended with one another; and it is only when they are held together in mutual harmony that the eternal light which shines through is manifested in its full richness.

The development of the eucharist in the church shows us as through a magnifying-glass—to borrow Newman's phrase—the various aspects which can be distinguished already in the New Testament. But the picture of the sacrament in the New Testament cannot but be drawn in a one-sided and incorrect way, if it is interpreted only by the experience of some one part of Christendom. So far as is possible, use must be made of the experience of the whole church.

The present study has been limited, except for the early church period, to the development in the West. We have, unfortunately, been prevented by the necessity of keeping the scope of this book within limits, from including a survey of the modern Eastern Church. It goes without saying that a study of the eucharistic piety and the liturgies of the Orthodox churches would have thrown a fuller light on the early church type, which has there been preserved more faithfully than in any other part of Christendom. Yet it is probable that such a study would not have added any essentially new features to the results which can be got from the early church evidence itself; and that the modern orthodox churches actually reflect, perhaps in a somewhat narrowed form, that same Eastern type which already in the later centuries of the early church period is seen emerging as a distinct type from the Western. The best possible method for a study of the latter type, particularly as seen in the Latin church of the Middle Ages, would be to display that type against the background of the contemporary and modern Eastern church. In our own day East and West have come nearer to one another than for a thousand years before; and in spite of the strangeness of all the externals of Eastern ways of worship to an evangelical Christian, the Scriptural and popular character of that service make him sometimes feel strangely at home, far more than at the Roman mass.

Eucharist.

The origins of the eucharistic Thanksgiving lie far back, behind the New Testament, in the liturgy of the Sabbath meal in the Jewish home; and they gain a richer meaning and a peculiar sacredness through their associations with the little Apostolic circle in Galilee, the embryo of the Christian church, where the Master himself used to sit at the head of the table. It was the memory of many a meal, of which our sources tell us nothing, that caused him to be recognised instantly at Emmaus in the breaking of bread. But the eucharistic thanksgiving of the church gained its full content primarily through his own work—in daily life and conversation, on the mount of the great sermon, on the cross, and in the triumph of Easter; a content which must needs reach out forwards, past the limits of this age, to the Second Advent, and anticipate the gladness of the heavenly Messianic feast.

And the freedom and power with which that thanksgiving was offered in the primitive church were recognised as the work of the Spirit, renewing in the faithful soul the redemptive work of the Son.

In the early liturgies we see the Jewish thanksgiving for the creation and for natural gifts making room for, and in part yielding place to, the joy of the New Covenant in the Divine work of redemption and in the fulfilment of the Divine promises. And in the *Sursum corda*, the Preface, and the *Sanctus* and *Hosanna*, most Christian churches to-day enjoy a pledge of their participation in the eucharist of the church of the martyrs. But while in course of time the Mass of the Catechumens came to be penetrated with tones of praise which did not originally belong to it, the full note of eucharistic thanksgiving came to be weakened, and in part lost, in the central part of the service.

It is one of the tragedies of the history of the liturgy that the ancient order of the eucharistic prayer was lost; the canon of the Latin mass laid the whole emphasis on the sacrificial idea. And when the Lutheran Reformation condemned the false popular conception of the eucharistic sacrifice, it failed to restore the act of thanksgiving in its true proportions; the very sense of the awfulness of the Presence seemed to hush the sound of jubilation, and the penitential atmosphere rarely allowed it to break through. Praise and thanksgiving were left chiefly to the ante-communion service; in the eucharistic act itself, they were limited, almost, to the thanksgiving of the individual for participation in the Divine gift. Zwingli and his spiritual descendants, down to the Congregationalists of our day, have indeed revived the element of thanksgiving; but the celebration has been primarily regarded as a confession of faith on the part of the congregation rather than as a sacrament in the old sense, and much of the deeper meaning of the rite has been lost.

It must be a primary object of the liturgical revival of our own day to recover the objective expression of corporate faith and worship in the service whose name means *the Thanksgiving*. The eucharist must take its right place as the central act of congregational praise.

Communion and Fellowship.

Communio—fellowship—has two sides: communion with the brethren and communion with God; and the eucharist is the expression and the seal of the unity of these two sides in communion with Christ. We cannot be members of Christ's body without being at the same time members one of another; and thus the unity of the brethren is lifted up into the mystery of union with God. This fellowship knows no limits narrower than the whole universal church of Christ; it begins with the circle round our own local altar, it extends to the fellowship of the whole church on earth, and it embraces not only the living but also those who are gone hence in the Lord. Thus it passes into Mystery—the Mystery of Christian fellowship; for these two aspects of the sacrament are inseparable, even though we are bound to study them separately. Finally, this fellowship is unreal if it does not find expression in life as well as in liturgy, and deepen and sanctify daily intercourse.

In the early church it is Paul and Augustine who give the noblest expression to the idea of sacramental fellowship. In the liturgy it is set forth not so much in any particular forms of words as in the corporate character of the service generally, and in the act of communion itself; it appears, however, in the forms belonging to the ancient Kiss of Peace. On the other hand, the eucharist lost something of its social meaning by its separation from the *agape*, and by the narrowing of the idea of the sacrifice.

It was at this point more than at any other that the mediæval church was unfaithful to its Augustinian inheritance. The great disaster was the loss of the communion of the people from the chief Sunday service; thereby the eucharist was robbed of one of its essential elements, the balance of the service was upset, and a narrow conception of the eucharistic sacrifice received disproportionate emphasis. The recovery of the idea of fellowship through communion was one of the greatest gains of the Reformation; it emerges first in the humanist theologians, and it finds a magnificent expression in some of Luther's early sermons. In practice, too, the act of communion recovered its place at the centre of the service; and the corporate character of the service was restored by the introduction of congregational singing, of common prayer made by priest and people together, and the use of the mother-tongue and the revival of preaching. Luther, however, failed to maintain adequately the true harmony of Fellowship and Mystery, and Lutheranism ended by perpetuating and even exaggerating the mediæval idea of communion as primarily a gift to the individual.

The same is true in large measure of the Anglican church.

The noble attempt of the Prayer Book of 1549 to make the communion the central act of Divine worship was not followed up in the subsequent development of the liturgy; even though the Prayer of Oblation in the Scottish Rite of 1637 provides a particularly fine liturgical expression of the deeper meanings of communion. And it has been the great blot on the wonderful revival of sacramental religion in the Anglican communion that it has failed to recover the unity of Communion and Eucharist. The problem is not solved by individual communions at an early service, followed by a high mass without communicants. The great service itself must include a communion of the people.

Commemoration.

The Christian Gospel proclaims that the Eternal has revealed himself in act, in time and space. Therefore the commemoration of God's acts in history must always take a central place in Christian worship. Christianity shares with Judaism this dependence upon history; and the Holy Scriptures preserve the record of God's mighty works, as of the words of his messengers. Thus the liturgical thanksgiving does not lose itself in indefiniteness, since it is concerned with definite Divine acts.

For Christianity, the central point which dominates all the history is the Passion and death of Christ, the work of redemption and atonement; it is this above all else which the Christian liturgy must bring to mind. But the commemoration of the cross does not stand in isolation; it is set in the context of the story of revelation as a whole. The inheritance which the Church received from the Synagogue, consisting both of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, and of the liturgical forms of thanksgiving that centred round the work of creation, was of the greatest positive value in this connection: for it provided a scheme in which the Passion could be commemorated as a fact of history, in its true historical setting and perspective, and so anchored fast in the world of reality. Had the cross been commemorated as an isolated fact, it would have been in danger of losing its moorings in history, and drifting into the vague timelessness of a mystery-myth. And even when the element of Commemoration in the anaphora came to be limited to the words of institution and the short recapitulation in the Anamnesis of the main points in the story of redemption, the Scripture-lessons in the Mass of the Catechumens remained to testify to the wider historical perspective. It was therefore a fact of the first importance that the earlier part of the service retained its connection with the *missa fidelium*.

The liturgical year helped in the same direction, particularly when, as in the Latin liturgies, it set its mark on the variable parts of the rite; here the proper prefaces are of special value. But the liturgical year brought in also the memory of the church's own history, as in the festivals of Saints; and even the reading of the lists of names in the Diptychs could help to stimulate the sense of fellowship with the departed, and the realisation of the past as still present in the holy rite, where time is taken up into the "now" of Eternity. The liturgical representation of the story of redemption as continued in the story of the church links up also present-day history with the one great act of redemption, which always claims the central place. Once again, it is a feature of positive value in the developed liturgies that the structure of the liturgy itself, with additions dating from different periods, forms a monument of the historical development of the church.

The historical element has been relatively neglected in those periods when the church has failed to perform her task of instruction, or when the Scripture lessons, and the prayers containing historical commemorations, have been obscured by being read in a language not understood by the people; nor is it easily correlated with the idea of the objective effectiveness of the sacrificial action, or with the timeless mysticism of the cult of the sacrament. This does not apply only to the Latin church of the Middle Ages. In all extra-liturgical devotions to the reserved sacrament the historical element is all but absent.

When the churches of the Reformation made the conscious effort to recover the element of Commemoration, there was danger of going to the opposite extreme. It was indeed a great gain that a new emphasis was laid on instruction and on Bible-reading, and that the vernacular regained its place in the service. But when the memory of the cross was set forth in isolation, as if it alone mattered, there was a failure to see that this historical commemoration cannot be given its due place apart from the setting which the ancient liturgies had provided for it. The Reformed churches in particular isolated the communion-service, cutting off from it practically every historical commemoration save that of the Passion itself, and making it a communion service pure and simple; at the same time this one-sided commemoration was emphasised at the cost of the element of Mystery.

Lutheranism and Anglicanism have both retained the Mass of the Catechumens, with its Scripture lessons, and have thereby safeguarded themselves in a measure against an isolated commemoration of the Passion. But the former of the two has tended to give to the sacred rite the one-sided character of a commemoration of Good Friday, especially where, under Reformed influence, the communion has come to be separated from the chief Sunday service, and so the classical form of the liturgy has been lost; and neither of the two has done justice to the commemoration of the story of redemption as continued in the church. It may be regretted, further, that practically everywhere in Christendom the Old Testament lesson has disappeared from the mass.

In the Christian Mystery the past is realised as present to faith. But it is necessary for the appreciation of its true significance as Mystery that the past should also be contemplated as past, and as belonging to history. Finally, the historical element has a high instructional value. There are many souls for whom it provides the most direct way of approach to the sanctuary of eucharistic worship.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Sacrifice, like prayer, is a central idea in all religions; but in Christianity it has been transformed. In Christianity there is no room for any such idea as that God can be influenced or propitiated by material gifts, or indeed that any *thing* can be offered by man to God, which is not his already. Here Christianity inherits and completes the idea which was outlined by the Hebrew prophets. In the deepest sense, Christianity acknowledges one sacrifice only, the self-oblation of God himself in Christ. In Christian worship, therefore, there can be no act of sacrifice or oblation which is not subordinated to the one supreme sacrifice.

Such a phrase as "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" can therefore only be used in a symbolical sense, recalling the language of the Old Testament. More widely, all oblation, all giving to God, may be taken as included in the idea of Thanksgiving; for no oblation that man can make has any religious value except as a spontaneous act of thanksgiving—and here, as elsewhere, the various aspects of the eucharist blend with one another, so that the offering of the material oblations in the eucharist, which recalls the Offertory of the early church, incidentally preserves that historical memory, and also expresses the idea of fellowship in the common oblation. But the deepest religious meaning of the oblation of material gifts is seen in their symbolical significance, as representing that oblation of self which is a necessary part of all living faith. The Christian has in truth but one gift which he can give to God, namely himself; and the eucharist could not be the central act of Christian worship if it did not include and express this idea. It is characteristic of Augustine that he expresses this idea of self-oblation in organic connection with the religious centre of the eucharist, the one great sacrifice: we are able to offer ourselves only as we are incorporated through communion in the supreme oblation of Christ. This Augustinian conception of eucharistic sacrifice reappears again and again in Christian history. wherever eucharistic devotion has been really deep and spiritual. It has been able to gain and keep its central place, because it shows man's self-oblation as subordinate to the one oblation of Christ.

It has been maintained that the acts and words of Jesus at the Last Supper were intended to interpret his death as sacrificial; in any case they have been so understood by the church from the earliest days. This constitutes the dramatic side of the liturgy. It is a showing forth, a representation, of the Divine act of redemption, of the one great sacrifice. And though it cannot be performed apart from communion —just as the action of the Master on that last night was inseparable from the disciples' communion—yet it can and ought to be regarded as a separate aspect of the rite, the "Act of Memorial," the "dramatic element in the liturgy," the "visible word." In this word-in-action the content of the whole Christian faith of the revelation of the Creator who is also the Redeemer is focussed with unique intensity, and proclaimed with uniquely eloquent brevity.

The eucharistic act is sacrificial because it represents and shows forth the one sacrifice, which, being eternal, is beyond the limitations of time and space. The true celebrant is not the human priest, but Christ the great High-priest, in the midst of his disciples; and this is the sacrificial aspect of the "Synoptic mystery-type," so beautifully expressed in the Mozarabic prayer, "Adesto, adesto, bone Pontifex, in medio nostri, sicut fuisti in medio discipulorum tuorum." The eucharist is the church's supreme act of prayer, the pleading of the one sacrifice, the expression in ritual of the formula which we repeat, often so heedlessly, in our prayers: "through Jesus Christ our Lord," "for Jesus Christ his sake."

But it is not only an action external to ourselves. In the act of communion we are united with our High-priest, and we enjoy the benefits of his sacrifice; but we are also dedicated to participate in his self-oblation. Here above all, the elements of sacrifice, fellowship, thanksgiving, and mystery blend with one another.

That the sacrificial idea in the eucharist had its dangers was evident already in the early church period. Since the idea of sacrifice is common to all religions, it is easy for notions of sacrifice which belong to a lower level to creep furtively into the higher religion. And when the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice was isolated from its natural connection with other aspects of the rite, it could come to be regarded, not as the representation and the appropriation of God's own sacrifice, but as a sacrifice offered by man, having an independent value of its own, and intended to influence God as it were from outside.

That a real degradation of the eucharistic sacrifice actually took place is most evident in the Latin church, in the later centuries of the early church, and the Middle Ages. This was chiefly due to the loss of the communion of the people as an integral part of the Sunday mass. In this way the road was also barred for a return to the Augustinian conception of the sacrifice. Thomas Aquinas distinguished the *sacrificium* from the *communio*; but Augustine had shown that it is precisely in the *communio* that the *sacrificium* finds its deepest meaning. In monastic circles, where communion was relatively frequent, the Augustinian conception was temporarily regained; but even Thomas à Kempis failed to rise to its full height. The monastic atmosphere concentrated attention on the communion of the individual soul with God in the reception of the sacrament; and thus *communio* was robbed of its wider meaning of "fellowship."

We have seen how this individualistic narrowing of the meaning of communion was inherited from the Middle Ages by the Reformation. It is true that in Luther's early writings we meet again the Augustinian idea, and the thought that the incorporation of the faithful into Christ is their sanctification to participate in his sacrifice. But these ideas were driven into the background of Luther's mind by the reaction against the false *ex opere operato* doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, and the Reformation came near to giving up the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice altogether. The clearest sign of a true recovery of the Augustinian conception is the noble Prayer of Oblation in the Anglican liturgy; the Lutherans understood the *sacrificium* exclusively as the "sacrifice of praise," and as the thanksgiving of the individual for the gift received in communion. A clear grasp of the "Memorial-aspect" is to be found only in a few places in the Reformation and post-Reformation period: in Laurentius Petri and King John III in Sweden, in the Caroline divines in England, and in the silent witness of the liturgy itself in the Lutheran, and to a lesser extent (at this period) in the Anglican church, to the dramatic side of the service. In the Reformed churches the extreme bareness of the ritual made their hostility to the sacrificial idea much more noticeable; yet it has regained its place to some extent in modern Presbyterianism, and it is by no means really absent from the Westminster *Directory*.

The Memorial-aspect is an indispensable part of the idea of the eucharist. When it is neglected, the balance of the service is lost, and an exaggerated subjectivism is the inevitable result. But the re-establishment of the eucharist as the chief Sunday service carries with it the recovery of the Memorial-aspect. There is no need to fear any danger to evangelical faith, provided that the Act of Memorial is always associated with communion; indeed, it sets forth, as nothing else can do, the fundamental idea of the evangelical faith, the uniqueness and the abiding power of the cross. It is the dramatic expression of that most intensely Christian, perhaps, of all liturgical texts: *Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi.*

Mystery.

The element of Mystery is present in all real personal religion. There is no greater mystery than the communion of man with God, however mediated. If the word mystery is applied in a special sense to the eucharist, it is because the sacrament is a focussing-point, at which the revelation of the Eternal in time and space is apprehended as a reality belonging to the distant past, which is nevertheless present to faith. Here the communion of the soul with God, which in itself is beyond space and time, is inseparably connected with the revelation of God in history, in Palestine, during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, in the man Jesus of Nazareth, by his incarnation and his sacrifice of himself; and this communion may become actual, at all times and in all places, where an altar is raised and the solemn words are said: "In the night that Jesus Christ was betrayed, he took bread. . . ." This communion is spiritual, as all communion with God is spiritual; yet it draws the material within its sphere and operates through a material means, just as the revelation of the Eternal in time was mediated through flesh and blood, when in the mystery of the Incarnation he embraced his created world.

There are three chief ways in which the element of Mystery in the eucharist is apprehended. The first is that of the personal presence of the Lord. As he was present at the Last Supper, so at Emmaus he was known in the breaking of bread; and so he is present "in the midst" at every eucharist as the true celebrant; present, according to this point of view, rather "at" than "on" the Holy Table, personally feeding his own with the sacred gifts, and imparting his own great gift, the forgiveness of sins and communion with God through him. This is the "Synoptic mystery-type": or, *the presence of our Lord as Priest.*

The second is the "Johannine mystery-type," or, *the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament.* The sacred elements are, according to his own word, his body and his blood, the means of his presence and the vehicles of his self-communication, whereby he comes to abide with the soul as her heavenly Guest; the hallowed bread is the bread of Life.

And third, we have noted the mystery of Communion-fellowship, whereby those who are united with Christ in the sacrament are united also with one another and share in the communion of saints, being made one bread, one body, through partaking of the one bread. This might be called the "Pauline type," or, *the presence of Christ in his mystical Body.* But these three modes of the eucharistic mystery are in no way exclusive of one another; rather they are complementary and necessary to one another.

But, as with the eucharistic sacrifice, so with the eucharistic mystery, abuses have entered; and following the abuses, controversies have covered with dust that which is most sacred. It has appeared from our analysis that the second of the three modes, the Johannine type, is specially in danger of degradation to a pagan level, when the sacred presence is interpreted in a materialistic way, and the other two modes are left out of sight; it is then that it becomes possible for the sacrament to be used "magically." Of this danger it would be hard to find a more striking illustration than the passage quoted above from the *Nova Ordinantia* of King John III of Sweden.

Transubstantiation, as expounded by Thomas Aquinas, is certainly not a materialistic doctrine; nevertheless, it made terms with a popular piety which was partly pagan in character, and it opened the way to a materialistic idea and use of the sacrament. But it is a more serious criticism of the doctrine of transubstantiation that it stated the problem of the eucharist in a wrong way, focussing attention to an altogether exaggerated extent on two points, the sacredness of the elements and the gift given in communion to the individual. The result has been that other aspects of the sacrament have been to an alarming extent left out of sight; and that alike in the Roman, Lutheran, and Anglican churches it has remained almost impossible to state the problem otherwise than as a Yes or No to the question whether the real presence in the elements is true.

The problem has been stated in a wrong way; and it is very necessary to-day to raise the matter on to a higher level, and learn to see how much there is in the mystery of the sacrament which this way of approach leaves out of sight. It is not that the doctrine of the real presence in the elements says too much, but that it says too little. It does indeed guard the objectivity of the Divine operation in the sacrament, and bar the way to the subjectivism which makes all depend on the faith of the recipient; for it saves the connection of the sacrament with the Incarnation. The sacrament has a material basis because the Son of God became man, and the Divine redemption extends to the physical life of man as well as to his mental and spiritual life. The trouble is that the emphasis on the real presence in the elements shows a dangerous tendency to occupy almost the whole field of view. The result is, first, a materialising of that which is spiritual, when the consecration is fixed at a definite time-moment, and the presence localised as " on " the altar; for the Saviour was locally present in Galilee and at Calvary, but the heavenly reality of that which is given in the sacrament is beyond time and place. Secondly, the other two modes of apprehending the mystery, the personal presence of Christ as Priest and the presence in his mystical Body, are in danger of being left out of sight.

The manner of the Divine presence in the sacrament must necessarily surpass our power to define it; in the words of the Lausanne Conference, " We are aware that the reality of the Divine presence and gift in this sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language." We do best if we affirm the truth of the real presence as " focussed " in the elements, and endeavour to avoid the crudity of our expression of it by balancing it with the other two modes of the eucharistic mystery: the thought of the personal presence of the Saviour "in the midst," as Priest, Lord and King, and that of the mystery of the body of Christ which is his church, and the equally mysterious presence of Christ in the hearts of our brethren.

We have tried to show that in the eucharist there are both a manifoldness of diverse aspects and a central unity; just as the jewel shows endless changes of light and colour as it is regarded from different angles. But the light which it refracts is one and the same: the holy Presence, the Mystery. It is true to say that the other aspects of the eucharist are only different sides of the Mystery, or, from the human point of view, different ways of approach to it; and the various forms of liturgy and systems of doctrine which we have surveyed have helped to show the richness of its variety in constantly changing forms. But it is also true that since the early centuries no part of Christendom has succeeded in expressing all the aspects together, in their harmony and completeness. Is it over-bold to look forward in hope to a future day when a fuller unity of Christendom shall again reveal the great Christian sacrament in the wholeness of its many-sided glory?

INDICES

I. INDEX OF NAMES

A number in *italics* signifies a bare footnote-reference.
A number in **black** type signifies a passage where the topic is dealt with in some detail.
Titles of books are frequently given in the Index in an abbreviated form. For the full title, see the first of the passages referred to.

Action oder Bruch des Nachtmals, **160** ff.
Acts of the Apostles, 11, 13, 19, 35, 41, 158
Adamson, *The Christian Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, 190, 194
Addai and Mary, liturgy of, 36, 41
Agenda, various Lutheran, 146 ff.
A Lasco, Joh., 149, 184, 186, 204
Alcuin, 73, 83
Amalarius of Metz, 83 f.
Ambrose, 47, 49, 61, 64, 85
Ambrosian rite, 74
American Episcopal Church, 208
Anderson Scott, *154*, 191
Andreas Laurentii Björnram, 264
Andrewes, Bishop L., 207 f.
Anglo-Catholicism, 214 ff.
Anrich, *Das antike Mysteriewesen*, 53, 65
Antididagma, 203
Apostolic Constitutions, 22, 32, 39; and see *Clementine Liturgy.*
Apuleius, 51
Armenian liturgy, 37, 41
Articles, Anglican, 200 f.
  of Schmalkalden, 109
Articuli Ordinantiæ, 245
Atchley, *62*
Attis, 34, 50, 51, 53
Augsburg Confession, 109, 131
Augustine, 20, **33** f., 40, **47**, 61, 66, 70, 80, 85, 89, 91, 138, 153, 200, 279, 284

Baptists, 194
Barclay, *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, 153
Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de la théologie positive*, 28, *33*, 44, 59, *61*, *70*
Bell, *Documents of Christian Unity*, *227*
Bellord, Bishop, 48
Benson, R. M., *Spiritual Letters*, 215
Berengarius, 86
Bergendoff, *Olaus Petri and the Ecclesiastical Transformation in Sweden*, 241
Bernard, in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, *30*
  St. John, 57
Bersier, **181** ff., 193
Bickell, *Messe und Pascha*, 38 f.
Bicknell, *Thirty-nine Articles*, *200*
Biel, Gabriel, 89
Birgitta, of Sweden, 85, 229
Bishop, E., *Liturgica historica*, 40, *71*
  The Genius of the Roman Rite, *71* *73*
Black rubric, 205 f., 214
Book of Common Order, 186
Book of Common Prayer, 180, 197, **202–206**, 227, 246
Book of Congregational Worship, 196 f.
Box, G. H., art. in *J.T.S.*, 18
Braun, *Liturgisches Handlexikon*, 79
Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, *22* and often in Ch. II.
  Preces Privatæ of Lancelot Andrewes, 208
  The English Rite, 204
Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, 14, *210*, *214*, *215*
Bucer, 119, 164, 169, 173, 200, 202, 204
Bugenhagen, 126, 127, 245

Cabrol, Dom., *63*, 68, 71
Cabrol's *Dictionnaire*, *18*, *32*, *33*, *36*, *40*, *68*
Cagin, Dom., 71
Calvin, **164–179**, 181, 188, 190
  Confessio fidei de eucharistia, 169
  Institutes, 164, 166, 169, 172 f.
  Prieres et chantz, 174 ff.
  Traicté, 164, 167, 169

Carlstadt, 103, 108, 111 f., 142, 153, 237
Casel, Dom., 71, *88*
  Das Gedächtnis des Herrn in der Liturgie, *34*
  Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier, 50, 51, *65*
Catherine of Genoa, 92
Catholic Encyclopædia, *37*, *48*
Celtic rite, 71, 221
Chrysostom, 33, 38, 40, 49, 60, 64, 140. *See* "St. Chrysostom, Liturgy of."
Church Assembly, 226
Church Orders, Lutheran, **125** ff., 133, 140, 245, 250 ff., 264
Chytræus, 126
Clement of Alexandria, 24, 45
Clement of Rome, 11, 18 f., 22, 28, 35, 37, 41, 44
Clementine Liturgy, **22**, 25 f., 30 f., **36**, 8 f., 45, 62, 65, 212
Colet, 97
Comparative religion, school of, 8, 52, 276
Confessions, early Reformed, 170
Congregationalism, 194 ff.
Connolly, Dom., 20
Consensus Tigurinus, 170
Contentio Veritatis, 220
Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, *221*
Corporation Act, 210
Covenanters, 186
Cranmer, Archbishop, 200 ff., 205
Cumont, *53*
Cyprian, 20, 32, 44, 46, 60, 67
Cyril, *Catecheses*, 41, 67

Dale, R. W., 195
Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, 175, *179*, 184
De Imitatione Christi, 90
Defensor fidei, 199
Didache, 6, 11, **18**, 23, 35, 39, 41, 44, 59, 66*:* (Prayer for Unity), 28, 30, (33), 80, 96, 184, 197, 234
Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, *50*
Directory, (Westminster Assembly), **187** ff., 193, 209, 285
Döber, 241 ff.
Dorner, *Augustinus*, *33*
Doumergue, 153, 180 f.
  Essai sur l'histoire du culte réformé, *171* f., 179 f.
  Jean Calvin, *154*
Doy, *Les liturgies de la Sainte Cene*, *172* ff. *179* f.
Drews, *Evangelische Kirchenkunde*, 146
  Clementinische Liturgie, 18 f., 20, 22, 37
Drews, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Canons*, 76, 71
Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrêtien* (E.T.), *63*, 71 f., 75
Duke Charles (Charles IX of Sweden), 237, 259 f.
Dutch rite, 184 f.

Edward, VI, 200 f.
Egyptian Church Order, see "Hippolytus."
Eisler, 8
Ekman, Archbishop, 272
Eleusinian mysteries, 50
Emmaus, 11, 18, 55, 286
English Church Union, 217 f.
English Hymnal, *63*, *143*, *212* f., 220
Erasmus, 97, 106, 153
Euchologion, **191** ff.

Farel, 173; *Maniere et fasson*, 172, 204
Fendt, *Gnostische Mysterien*, 53
  Der lutherische Gottesdienst, *111*, etc.
First Prayer Book of King Edward VI, **202** ff.
Formula Concordiæ, 110, 127
Forsyth, 196
Fortescue, *The Mass*, 38, 62, 71, 75, 76, 92
Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, *83*, etc.
Franzén, 251
Free Catholic Movement, 197
Free Churches (England), 194 ff.
  (Sweden), 272 f.
French Reformed Church, 180 ff.
Frere, *Principles of Religious Ceremonial*, *83*

Gallican rites, 30, 31, 37, **71** ff.
Gardner, P., 4
Gelasian Sacramentary, 25, 73, 84
Genevan rite, **171** ff., 179
Gesenius, Justus, 141
Gnostics, 45, 53
Goeller, 63
Goetz, *Die Heutige Abendmahlsfrage*, *108*, 137 f., 155
Goguel, *L'eucharistie*, 5 f., *27*, 44
Gooding, 218
Gore, Bishop, *The Body of Christ*, 26, 47, 58, *61*, *63*, 216, *220*, 224
Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung*, 144
Gregorian Sacramentary, 73
Gregory the Great, 73, 84
Gustav Vasa, 236, 238, 244, 248

Harnack, A., 44, 60
  Brot und Wasser, 4
  History of Dogma, *33*, 94, 108

Hebrews, Epistle to the, 18, 43 f., 64, 99 f., 137 f.
Hécler, Pastor, 183
Heienbrok, 151
Heiler, *Das Gebet*, *88*
Der Katholizismus, 63, *88*, 122
Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl*, 6
Henry VIII, 199 f.
Herman, Archbishop, 202
Herring, Archbishop, 210
High-church school in Germany, 150 ff.
Hippolytus of Rome, 20, 32
Anaphora of, 7, 20 ff., 23, 29, 30, 41, 62
Hoen, 103
Hünzinger, 106
Hymns Ancient and Modern, *212* f., 220

Ignatius of Antioch, 11, 18, 28, 35, 41, 44, 57, 59
Inge, W. R., *Contentio Veritatis*, 220
Speculum Animæ, 54
Innocent I, 32, 40, 75
Irenæus, 45, 60, 62, 106, 256
Irvingites, 194
Isis, 34, 53

Jacoby, *Die Liturgik der Reformatoren*, *95*, *108*, 139
John, Gospel of, 11, 27, 35, 44, **57** f., 100, 155, 161, 185
John of Damascus, 61
John III of Sweden, 236, **254** ff., 285
Nova Ordinantia, 255 f.
Liturgia Suecanæ Ecclesiæ, 257 ff.
Jülicher, 5
Justin Martyr, 20, 25, 28 f., 31, 35 f., 41, 45, 49, 54, 59, 65, 263
Justus Jonas, 200

Kähler, *Die Sacramente als Gnadenmittel*, 147
Kantz, Kaspar, 112 f., 128
Kirk, K. E., *58*, 219 f.
Kittel, G., 14
Kliefoth, 1, 117, 131, 145 f., 149, 167, 262
Knox, Alexander, 215
Knox, John, 186 f., 205
Knox, Wilfrid, *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England*, *218*, *224*, *225*
Köhler, W., *Zwingli und Luther*, *104*, *106*, *129*, 158
Köstlin, *Die Theologie Luthers*, *95*, *103*, etc.

Lacey, *The Anglo-Catholic Faith*, 224
Lambeth Conference Report, 227
Laud, Archbishop, 208
Laurentius Petri, Archbishop, 236, **249** ff., 285
Dialogus, 249 f.
Church Order, 250 ff., 259, 264
Lausanne Conference, 287
Leo Judæ, 153
Leonine Sacramentary, 47, 73, 75, 84
Liber Ratisbonensis, 139
Liberal Evangelicalism, 219
Lietzmann, H., *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 6 f., 8, 19, 23 f., *29*, *62*, *63*
Lindberg, *Die schwedischen Missalien des Mittelalters*, 228
Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, 30, 37, etc.
Löhe, 1, 146
Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, 4
Le quatrieme Évangile, 58
Loofs, *59*, 60, *70*, *86*
Lorentz, *De Egyptische Kerkordering*, 20
Lucian, 49
Luke, Gospel of, 7, 9, 34, 55 f.
Luther, 81, 86, **94–144**, 153 ff., 164 ff., 168 f., 170, 190, 199, 218, 231 ff.
Dass diese Worte . . . fest stehen, **105** f.
De Captivitate Babylonica, **100** f., 199, 232
De digna preparatione cordis, 95
De Libertate Christiana, 96, 100
Deutsche Messe, **120** ff., 126 ff., 132
Formula Missæ, **115** ff., 127, 136, 160, 261
Greater Catechism, 108
Lesser Catechism, 103, 144
Sermon von den guten Werken, 98
Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament, **95** ff., 100, 102
Sermon von dem neuen Testament, 98, 101
Sermon von dem Sakrament, 104
Vom Abendmahl Christi, Bekenntnis, **107** f.
Vom Anbeten des Sakraments, 103
Vom Ordnung Gottesdiensts, 114
Lyons, 71

Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, *95*
Maclean, *Ancient Church Orders*, *26*
Mark, Gospel of, 3, 5, 9 ff., 34, 55 f.
Matthew, Gospel of, 34
Mehl, *Vom Bau und Ausbau der Liturgie*, 151
Melanchthon, 110, 131, 139, 143, 202
Messenius, 237
Methodism, 194
Mithra, 34, 50, 53
Monod, *Pour communier*, 183

Moule, Bishop, 219
Mozarabic rite, 63, 72, 283
Müntzer, Thomas, 113 f., 119, 123

Neoplatonism, 53, 66
Nestorian liturgy, 40, 41
Nestorius, 63
Newbolt, *The Sacrament of the Altar*, 225
Nominalism, 87, 100
Non-jurors, 212, 214
Nördlingen, 112, 120
Norman, Chancellor, 245
Novatian, 22, 32
Nova Ordinantia, 255, 286
Nuremberg, 120, 127, 241 ff.

Ockham, 86, 106
Œcolampadius, 97, 107, 114, 164 f., 177
Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, 9, *18*, *19*, 24, 28
Olaus Petri, **231** ff., 236, **237** ff.
  Answer to an Unchristian letter, 231
  Answers to Twelve Questions, 232
  Christian Exhortation to the Clergy, 232
  Een lijten Postilla, 235
  Een nyttog Postilla, **233** f.
  Handbook, 239
  Little Book on the Sacraments, 233
  The Swedish Mass, **240** ff., 245
Orchard, W. E., 197 f.
Origen, 38, 47, 60
Ornaments Rubric, 205, 222
Orthodox Eastern Church, 68, 277
Osterwald of Neuchâtel, 179 f.
Otto, R., 150
Oxford Movement, 1, 211, 215, 221

Paschasius Radbertus, 86
Paul the Apostle, 4, 6-13, 18, 27, 35, 56, 279, and see "Pauline Mystery-type."
Peter d'Ailly, 87, 101
Pietism, 145
Pious Country Parishioner, The, 210
Proctor and Frere, *History of B.C.P.*, *201*, etc.
Prussia, Union Church of, 146
Puritans, 186, 188, 205
Pusey, 215

Quakers, 194
Queen Elizabeth, 205 f.
Quensel, 237, 247
Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*, 217

Rabanus Maurus, 86
Ratramnus, 86
Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, *51*, *53*
Reservation (ed. Woods), 225
Reuterdahl, Archbishop, 271
Réville, *Les origines de l'eucharistie*, 5 f., 8, 10, 35, 44, 56, 59
Revised Prayer Book, 223, 227
Rhenpfalz rite, 184
Ridley, 200 f., 204
Rietschel, *Liturgik*, *74*, *92*, 149
Robinson, A., *20*
Roman rite, 30 f., **71** ff., 124 f.
Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 222

St. Basil, liturgy of, 67
St. Chrysostom, liturgy of, 32, 46, 258
St. James, liturgy of, 22, 31, 32, 39, 62, 63
St. Mark, liturgy of, 30, 32, 39, 76
Savoy Declaration, 194
Scheel, *Martin Luther*, *95*
Schmidt, K. L., 7, 9
Schweitzer, A., *Das Abendmahl*, 2 ff., 5
Scots Confession, 170
Scottish rites, Anglican, 208
  Presbyterian, 186 ff.
Scotus, 86, 87
Second Prayer-Book of King Edward VI, 204 f.
Seeberg, 92, 102, 153
  Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, *85* ff., *95* and often.
Sehling, *Die, evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrh.*, *111*, *113*, *114*, *117*, 125, 133
Serapion, Anaphora of, 6, 21, 30, 41, 76, 77
Shemôneh 'Esreh, 19, 24, 28
Simplex et pia deliberatio, 202
Smend, 148 f.
  Die evangelischen deutschen Messen, *111* ff., *159*, 163, *174*
Spener, Philipp Jakob, 141
Spitta, 3 f., 14, 148
Srawley, *Early History of the Liturgy*, *10*, *32*, *36*, *38*, *63*, *75*
Stone, *History of the Holy Eucharist*, *64*, *79* f., *97*, *200*, and often in Ch. VI.
Strassburg, 108, 164, 173 f., 177, 179
Strauss, David, 3
Stuckert, *Kirchenkunde der reformierten Schweiz*, 184
Sundberg, Archbishop, 271
Syrian Jacobites, liturgy of, 26

Tachanunim, 24
Tephillah, 24
Tertullian, 20, 26, 45, 49, 60, 65, 67
Test Act, 210
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 60

Thomas à Kempis, 81, 89 f., 284
Thomas Aquinas, 79, 80, 87, 88, 97, 284
Tracts for the Times, 14

Unitarians, 194
Uppsala, 229, 271 f.
Uppsala-möte, 237, 259 f.

Vadstena, 229, 245, 247
Völker, *Mysterium und Agape*, *10*, 19, 29, 44, 50
von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, *57*, *92*, *93*
von Schubert, 270 f.

Waggett, *The Holy Eucharist*, 216 f.
Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church*, 22
Waterland, 214
Weiss, J., *Das Urchristentum*, 9, 12
Wesley, Charles, 194, 221
Wesley, John, 145, 221
Wessel, John, 89
Westminster Assembly, 186 ff., 209
Westminster Confession, 170, 194
Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, 11, 36, 41, 45 f., 52
Wickham Legg, *English Church Life*, 209, 210
Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio*, 44, *45*, 47
Wilson, *Before the Altar*, 225
Wittenberg, 111, 133, 140
Wordsworth, *The National Church of Sweden*, *229*, *237*, *239*, *250*, 274
Wotherspoon and Kirkpatrick, *A Manual of Church Doctrine*, 191
Württemberg, 126, 140, 184, 250
Wyclif, 89

Yelverton, *The Mass in Sweden*, 241, *250*, 257, 260
  The Swedish Rite, 266 ff.
Yôtzer, 24

Zürich rite, 159 ff., 179
Zwingli, 5, 61, 97, **104** ff., **153–164**, 165, 167, 169, 173, 178, 180, 183, 185, 278
  Action oder Bruch des Nachtmals, **160** ff., 173
  Ad Matthæum Alberum epistola, 104, 154, 155
  Amica exegesis, 157
  Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden, 154
  De canone missæ epicheiresis, 154, **159** f.
  De vera et falsa religione commentarius, 104, 154 f.
  Unterrichtung von Nachtmahl Christi, 104

II. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Aaronic blessing, 117 f.
Abendmahlsnot, 147, 149
Adesto, 63, 283
Agape, 6, 11, 18, 29, 68, 279
Agnus Dei, 92, 113, 117, 123, 128, 192, 201, 203, 242 f., 247, 259, 269, 285
Alleluya, 26, 39, 74, 79, 132, 220, 266, 269
Alloiosis-doctrine, 107, 156
Altar, 44, 205, 208, 251
Anamnesis, 36, 76 f., 82, 182, 203, 212, 258, 280
Anglican Church and Swedish Church, 215, 227, 273
Anglo-Catholic usage, 223 ff.
Apostles, Festivals of, 40, 136, 245, 262
Augustinian view of communion, 33, 47, 90, 97, 100, 140, 204, 216, 234, 279, 283, 284
Benedictus qui venit, 22, 24, 26, 117
"Body of Christ," two meanings, 56, 133, 234, 286 f.
"Breaking of bread," 6, 10, 13, 27, 35, 277
Breviary-offices, evangelical, 113, 115, 128, 202, 245

Canon of the mass, 40, 47, 62, **76** f., 124, 132
  silent recitation of, 65, 99, 110
  criticisms of, 115, 159
  omission of, 116, (242), 246
  adaptations of, 113 f., 159, 180, 182, 203, 205, 209, 227, 258 f.
"Canonise," 40
"Captivity" of the sacrament, 81, 100 f.
Commemoration, or the Historical aspect: **34–41**, 53, **280** f., 285

Commemoration:
  in Middle Ages, 73, 75, 82–84, 89
  in Lutheranism, 135–137
  in the Reformed churches, 162 f., 178, 185, 193, 195, 198
  in Anglicanism, 212
Common prayer, 31, 212
Communion-aspect, 3 ff., **27–34**, 54, **80** f., **133** ff., 157 f., 178, 198, 211 ff., **278** ff.
Communion, and Fellowship, **33** f., 96 ff., 148, 157 f., 166 f., 181 f., 189, 192, 195, 209, 234 f., 273
  individual aspect of, 57, 81, 90, 131 f., 135, 142 f., 147, 149, 279
  of the people at the chief service, 32, 33, 80 f., 126, 133, 149, 224, 248, 263 f., 279 f.
  in both kinds, 81, 119
  kneeling, 127, 141, 176, 205, 262
  sitting, 148, 161, 163, 182 f., 189
  frequent, 32, 81, 134, 209, 224 f., 248
  of the sick, 143, 182, 225, 233, 239
Confession, private, 91 f., 112, 118 f., 129 f., 177, 225, 253, 264
Confirmation, 129
Consubstantiation, 101
" Conversion-doctrine," 61
Corpus Christi, Feast of, 79, 80, 88
Creed, Apostles', 33, 161, 241, 247, 267
  Nicene, 32, 79, 116, 132, 159, 192, 203, 228, 241, 247, 267
  metrical, 122, 246

Decalogue, 204, 211
" Die Vorschule Christi," 52
Diptychs, 40, 136, 281
Disciplina arcani, 54, 65, 66
Discourse on the Bread of Life (John vi), 57, 100, 155 f., 161, 185
Dramatic aspect of liturgy, 43, 82, 213, 249, 260, 283

Easter Communion, 80, 91, 161, 227, 244, 248
Elevation, 88, 99, 111, 117, 123, 224, 259
Epiclesis, 30, 62 f., 76 f., 92, 192, 203
Eschatological outlook, 4 f., 9, 12, 20, 56, 64
Eucharist, 18 ff., 116, 157; *and see* " Thanksgiving."
Evening celebrations, 67, 147, 226, 264
Examination, 118, 128, 253
Expositions of the Mass, 79, 83, 110

Fast before communion, 67, 119, 128, 188, 210, 224, 231
Forgiveness of sins, 66, 91, 102, 117, 142, 261
Four celebrations a year, 162, 177, 183, 186, 189, 209

Gloria in excelsis, 26, 79, 83, 111, 116, 122, 126, 132; (in Reformed churches), 161, 180, 182, 197; (Anglican), 202, 204; (Swedish), 241, 247 f., 260, 267
Great Entry, 63, 74

Habitus, 93
Hallel, 38 f.
High-priestly prayer (John xvii), 27
Historical element, *see* " Commemoration."
Hosanna, 20, 26, 39, 262, 278
Hymns, 119, 124, 132, 212 f., 220, 260

Impanation-theory, 86, 101
Incarnation and Sacrament, 58, 101, 107, 143, 159, 177, 189 f., 216, 255, 287
Intention, specialising of, 84 f.
Intolerance, 54
" In, with, and under," 110

Jewish religious meals, 11, 27, 277
" Johannine mystery-type," **57** f., 60, 61, 69, 81, 93, 106, 142 f., 212, 214 f., **286**

Kedûshah, 24
Kelchhälter, 183
Kiddûsh, 9, 19, 29
Kiss of Peace, 31, 40, 75, 80, 279
Kyrie eleison, 74

Last Supper, **3-13**, 18, 34, **43**, **55**, 102, 122, 185, 188
Lauda Sion Salvatorem, 79
Lectio continua, 114, 136, 241, 245
Litany, 31, 74, 80
Liturgical Year, 40, 73, 82, 136, 163, 193, 241, 245 f., 281
Liturgy, nature of, 14, 148
  and doctrine, 16
Local heaven, idea of, 105 f., 156 f., 168 f., 178
Localisation of the Presence, 62 ff., 87 f., 109, 143, 168, 216, 220, 287

" Magic," 53, 58, 88, 183, 286
Manducatio indignorum, 110, 143
Martyrs, festivals of, 40
Mass of the Catechumens, 26, 37, 253, 278, 280, 282
Maundy Thursday, 67
Memorial-aspect, 3 ff., **43–48**, 60, 138–141, **283** ff.

Memorial-aspect in Lutheranism, 102, 130, **138** ff., 147, 149, 151, 232, 249, 250 ff., 257 ff., 261
  in Reformed churches, 157, 163, 167, 191, 193
  in Anglicanism, 203, 207, 212 f., 218, 221, 223
Moment of consecration, 63, 287
Mysteries, heathen, 34, 49–54
Mystery, The Christian, 27, **53–69**, 279, 282, **285–288**
  in the Middle Ages, 86–90
  in Luther, 95, 97, 101, 109, 122, 123 f., 141 ff.
  in Lutheranism, 141 ff., 148, 235, 256
  in Reformed churches, 157, 163, 167 f., 178, 188, 193, 196
  in Anglicanism, 213 f., 219, 224

Non-communicating attendance, 33, 140, 223 f., 252, 256

Offene Schuld, Die, 92, 142, 239, 248
Offertory, 75, 116, 123, 203
Old Testament lesson, 37, 74, 282

"Paganising of Christian worship," 46, 64, 69, **84** ff., 138, 255, 284, 286
Passover, 10, 38 f., 42
"Pauline Mystery-type," **56**, 97, 166, 184, 212, 234, 279, **286**
Penance, 91, 118, 128 ff., 177, 252 f., 264 f.
Proper Prefaces, 75, 78, 114, 127, **136**, 182, 212, 258, 261, 281

Real Presence, *see* "Mystery" and "Localisation."
Reserved Sacrament, 87 ff., 225, 281
Res sacramenti, 61, 86
Revolt against the sacrifice of the mass, 99, 101, 115, 137 f., 159, 167, 171
Roman doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, 47 f., 77 f.
  emphasis on moral duty, 92
  terseness, 73, 125

Sacramentum (Zwingli), 155, 165
Sacrifice of Christ, 42, 138, 282
Sacrifice, eucharistic, **42–48**, 60–64, 84 f., 99 f., **138** f., **282–285**
  (i) "S. of praise and thanksgiving," 44 f., 131, 203, 282
  (ii) offering of the gifts, 45, 203, 282 f.
  (iii) personal self-oblation, 43 47, 90, 131, 166 f., 203, 234 f., 283; *and see* "Augustinian view of communion."
  (iv) The Act of Memorial, 43 ff., 56, 60 f., and further refs. under "Memorial-aspect."
  See also "Paganising," "Roman doctrine," "Revolt against the sacrifice of the mass."
Sacrificium and *communio*, 87, 284
Sacrificium and *oblatio*, 46
Sacrificium and *sacramentum*, 131
Sancta sanctis, 26, 66, 192
Sanctus, Jewish origin, 19, 24, 39
  absence from *Hippolytus*, 21, 23–26
  dislocation in Lutheran rites, 117, 119, 123, 127, 242, 246, 258 f., 269
  reappearance in Reformed rites, 163, 179, 182, 192, 197
Schmücke dich, O liebe Seele, 143, 221
Scripture-lessons, 37 f., 82, 135 ff.
Sequences, 79
Sermon, the, 1, 38, 74, 82, 122, 149, 162, 231 f., 239, 243, 246
Silence, 65 f., 68, 150
Spiritual communion, 111, 224
"Symbolic-sacrificial" type, 60, 78, 84
Synecdoche, 104
"Synoptic mystery-type," **55** ff., 60, 64, 69, 70, 142, **286**

Te Deum, 79, 113, 128
"Testament-idea," **98–103**, 134, 140, 232, 235
Thanksgiving, aspect of, **18–26**, 43, **78** ff., **130–133**, 148, 157 f., 187, 196, 211, **277** f.
Transubstantiation, 61, **87** ff., 97, 100 f., 171, 217 f., 229, **286** f.
True Vine, The (John xv), 27, 57
"Tyranny of the pulpit," 1, 162, 196, 274

Variable forms, 40, 72 f.
Vestments, use of, 111, 118, 122, 128, 141, 159, 202, 204, 221, 251, 259,
Via media, 126, 205, 250, 255
"Visible word," 48, 140, 186, 283

Ubiquity, doctrine of, **104** ff., 143, 170, 235
Unity of the Church, 30, 33, 80, 227, 288

Words of Institution, 41, 63, 99, 117, 123, 127, 196

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

1149 W

DATE DUE

BV
823
.B73
1930
c.2

41,060

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
3 0645 1000 3575 3